

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
VON DER MÜHLL, E.—Rousseau et les réformateurs du théâtre, . . .	161
GRUBBS, H. A.—An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy: J. B. Rousseau as an Imitator of Ben Jonson, . . .	170
MACMILLAN, DOUGALD.—Some Notes on Eighteenth-Century Essex Plays, . . .	176
BAIRD, J. R.—Milton and Edward Ecclestone's 'Noah's Flood,' . . .	183
LOGAN, J. V.—Wordsworth and the Pathetic Fallacy, . . .	187
JONES, ALICE E.—A Note on Charles Hopkins (c. 1671-1700), . . .	191
PETTIT, HENRY.—The Dating of Young's 'Night-Thoughts,' . . .	194
FOX, BERNICE.—Revision in Browning's 'Paracelsus,' . . .	195
SNYDER, EDWARD D.—A Note on R. L. S., . . .	197
GUERARD, ALBERT, JR.—The Dates of Some of Robert Bridges' Lyrics, . . .	199
KNICKERBOCKER, W. S.—Arnold, Shelley, and Joubert, . . .	201
ATKINS, STUART.—'Urfaust' L. 300, . . .	201
WHITBREAD, L.—Four Text-Notes on 'Deor,' . . .	204
SAVAGE, HENRY.—Arcite's Maying, . . .	207
BROWN, C. S., JR. AND R. H. WEST.—"As by the Whelp Chastised Is the Leon," . . .	209
COOLEY, FRANKLIN.—William Taylor of Norwich and 'Beowulf,' . . .	210
GUINAGH, KEVIN.—Source of the Quotation from Augustine in 'The Parson's Tale,' 985, . . .	211

REVIEWS:—

ASTOR SEWELL, A Study of Milton's Christian Doctrine. [A. H. Gilbert.]	212
E. M. W. TILLYARD, The Miltonic Setting; J. S. DIEKHOF, Milton on Himself. [W. E. Parker.]	215
A. W. SECORD (ed.), Defoe's Review. [A. D. McKillop.]	218
T. M. H. BLAIR (ed.), The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Nessel. By John Banks. [A. H. Nethercot.]	221
W. KELLERMANN, Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Perceval-roman. [Leo Spitzer.]	222
H. C. BAILEY and A. W. POLLARD, A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1700. [G. E. Dawson.]	226
E. K. CHAMBERS, Samuel Taylor Coleridge; G. MCKENZIE, Organic Unity in Coleridge. [A. D. Snyder.]	227
DELANCY FERGUSON, Pride and Passion, Robert Burns 1759-1796. [R. T. Fitzhugh.]	229
R. L. RUSK (ed.), The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson. [Norman Feeder.]	231
F. OLIVERO, Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di Walter Pater. [D. A. Stauffer.]	232
E. M. W. TILLYARD and C. S. LEWIS, The Personal Heresy. [George Boas.]	233
B. BOYCE, Tom Brown of Facetious Memory. [O. L. Day.]	234
C. S. LEWIS, Rehabilitations and Other Essays. [E. D. Jameson.]	235

BRIEF MENTION: W. O. CYPER, The Literature of the English Bible;
J. C. TROXELL (ed.), Rossetti's *Sister Helen*; S. A. TANNENBAUM, Ben
Jonson (A Concise Bibliography); M. W. BLACK (ed.), Elizabethan and
Seventeenth-Century Lyrics; M. S. SERJEANTSON and L. N. BROUGHTON,
Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature; W. MURISON,
Sir David Lindsay; J. D. A. OGILVY, Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers
(670-804); J. RAITH, Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur; W. KLEINKE,
Englische Fürstenspiegel; F. OLIVERO (ed.), *Beowulf*; G. HOFSTAND, *The
Siege of Troye, A Study*; H. WATSON (trans.), A. DIOPSON (ed.),
Valentine and Orson,

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with Intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. E. Roulston, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNE.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NND.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

The General Index of volumes 1 to 50, xii + 310 pages, was published in December 1935. The price is \$5.00 net.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

ELH

A Journal of English Literary History

ELH, the only American journal devoted exclusively to anglistics, is now published for the Tudor and Stuart Club by The Johns Hopkins Press.

Issued quarterly beginning with March. Subscription, \$2.50 a year. Business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

itors
the
cript
icles
the
s of
Quo-
not
MP.
itors
ness

E,
is
r.

E

Modern Language Notes

Volume LV

MARCH, 1940

Number 3

ROUSSEAU ET LES RÉFORMATEURS DU THÉÂTRE

Parmi les nombreux problèmes que soulève la *Lettre sur les spectacles* (1758) il y en a un auquel on a prêté fort peu d'attention. Quelle a été l'influence de cet ouvrage sur le théâtre, en particulier sur les auteurs dramatiques partisans du genre sérieux? Sans doute c'est Diderot qui fut le principal théoricien du drame et Rousseau venait de rompre avec lui. Malgré cela les défenseurs du théâtre épuré doivent énormément à Rousseau et l'on est même forcé de constater, avec quelque surprise d'abord que, tout en reprenant quelques idées de Diderot, ils aiment à se réclamer de l'autorité de Rousseau. Que pour la nouvelle génération il n'y eût aucun désaccord entre les théories de Diderot et les idées de Rousseau, cela n'a guère été remarqué et l'influence de Rousseau sur les réformateurs du théâtre est restée mal expliquée. Relevons cependant que Jules Lemaître déjà avait indiqué quelques analogies¹ et surtout que Marguerite Moffat, dans sa thèse sur *Rousseau et la querelle du théâtre au 18^e siècle*, constate une étroite parenté entre les idées exprimées dans la *Lettre à d'Alembert* et celles de Thorel de Campigneulles, Nouel de Buzonnière, Beaumarchais, Restif de la Bretonne, Louis Sébastien Mercier et Cubières qui sont tous partisans du théâtre réformé.² Voilà une liste d'auteurs imposante et leurs écrits qui s'échelonnent sur une vingtaine d'années indiquent un courant bien marqué. Miss Moffat, tout en reconnaissant que ces auteurs sont des admirateurs passionnés de Rousseau, a cependant cru voir dans leurs essais sur le théâtre des réfutations de la thèse de Rousseau. Il y a là une interprétation peu satisfaisante car on n'a l'habitude d'écrire contre les maîtres qu'on admire.

¹ Voir "Jean Jacques et le théâtre," *Impressions de théâtre*, t. 6, p. 138.

² Paris, Boccard, 1930, pp. 224-245, 265-272, 326.

Pour arriver à une explication moins contradictoire de ce problème nous examinerons d'abord les opinions de Rousseau sur le drame, puis nous verrons ce que ces auteurs pensaient de Rousseau.

C'était une habitude de Rousseau, dès qu'il abordait une question, d'élever le débat et de faire intervenir, à propos de telle circonstance particulière, les idées maîtresses de sa philosophie. Nous savons que ce fut le cas pour *l'Emile* qui devait n'être qu'un programme d'éducation pour guider une jeune mère et que la *Lettre à d'Alembert* fut composée pour empêcher l'établissement d'un théâtre à Genève. Si on veut bien comprendre le point de vue de Rousseau et de ses disciples, il ne faut point oublier qu'il traite, dans la première partie de cet ouvrage, au moins deux questions qui n'ont entre elles aucun rapport nécessaire et permanent: une question générale, celle de la valeur morale du théâtre, et une question particulière, celle de la moralité du théâtre français. C'est précisément pour n'avoir pas tenu compte de l'indépendance de ces deux questions qu'on n'a pas, en général, songé à étudier l'influence de Rousseau sur le théâtre. On le prenait pour un ennemi déclaré des spectacles, ce qui est aussi faux que de croire qu'il ait invité les Parisiens à reprendre la vie des sauvages.³

C'est contre Voltaire et les autres philosophes que s'élève Rousseau en déclarant que les spectacles, même s'ils étaient parfaits, ne pourraient pas devenir la source principale sinon unique de la morale privée et publique.⁴ Sauf Mercier, qui est d'accord avec Rousseau,⁵ les réformateurs ne se sont guère occupés de la valeur morale du théâtre en général et nous pouvons laisser cette question de côté.

Ayant réfuté la thèse de ceux qui déclarent le théâtre nécessaire à la morale, Rousseau passe à l'examen de la moralité du théâtre français. C'est par ses critiques de la tragédie et de la comédie qu'il a exercé son influence et il nous faut au moins indiquer ses conclusions. Les tragédies nous montrent surtout des scélérats triomphants (Atrée, Mahomet) ou encore des passions horribles (Phèdre, Médée). Tous ces personnages sont d'ailleurs si loin de

³ Sur ce sujet voir la préface de *Narcisse; Lettre à d'Alembert*, éd. L. Brunel, Paris, Hachette, pp. 99-100; *Correspondance générale*, éd. Th. Dufour, t. 4, p. 139 (Lettre de Vernet à Rousseau du 24 nov. 1758 et *ibid.* p. 153 la réponse de Rousseau du 18 déc. 1758).

⁴ Voir F. Gaiffe, *Le drame au 18e siècle*, p. 78-92; Bécлар, *Mercier*, p. 154, 166-170.

⁵ Voir *Du théâtre*, Amsterdam, 1773, pp. 5-6.

nous et les situations où ils se trouvent si extraordinaires que le spectateur ne songe jamais à en tirer une morale pratique.⁶ Quant à la comédie "dont les mœurs ont avec les nôtres un rapport plus immédiat, et dont les personnages ressemblent mieux à des hommes," la morale en est franchement mauvaise. Au lieu de chercher à corriger les vices elle se contente, le plus souvent, d'attaquer les ridicules et consiste surtout à nous faire rire des fripons habiles qui dupent les honnêtes gens.⁷ Il est à noter que l'argumentation de Rousseau se concentre presque entièrement autour des genres établis en quoi elle n'est pas très originale. En effet, les témoignages de l'époque prouvent abondamment que ces œuvres ne satisfont plus le goût du public.⁸

Reste à savoir ce que Rousseau pensait des genres nouveaux. Il en parle peu et toujours très superficiellement,⁹ comme s'il avait hâte d'en avoir fini avec un sujet où il n'est pas à l'aise. Il déclare que les auteurs qui font des pièces plus épurées ennuiet et, plus loin, tout en admettant qu'un homme de génie pourrait inventer "un genre de pièces préférable à ceux qui sont établis," il prévoit que "ce nouveau genre ayant besoin pour se soutenir des talents de l'auteur, périra nécessairement avec lui."¹⁰ Il va de soi que cette supposition, qui s'explique par son animosité contre Diderot,¹¹ est toute arbitraire et que le jugement porté sur la comédie larmoyante est exagéré en ce qu'il ne tient nul compte du succès immense obtenu par Nivelle de la Chaussée.¹² C'est là comme qui

⁶ Voir *Lettre sur les spectacles*, p. 53. Plus loin, faisant l'analyse de *Bérénice*, il constate que le spectateur porte tout son intérêt sur l'amour de Bérénice sans songer jamais à tirer une leçon du dénouement. "La reine, dit-il, part sans le congé du parterre: l'empereur la renvoie invitatus invitam, on peut ajouter *invito spectatore*. Titus a beau rester Romain, il est seul de son parti; tous les spectateurs ont épousé Bérénice." *Ibid.* p. 83.

⁷ Voir *ibid.*, pp. 53-55.

⁸ Voir Gaiffe, *op. cit.* pp. 15-23; *id.* *Le rire et la scène française*, Paris, Boivin, 1931, pp. 133-136.

⁹ Rousseau ne mentionne pas Marivaux. En avocat habile il sait éviter ce qui pourrait nuire à sa thèse.

¹⁰ *Lettre sur les spectacles*, éd. Brunel, p. 43.

¹¹ Diderot n'a pas manqué de s'en plaindre amèrement. Rousseau "dit du mal de la comédie larmoyante, écrit-il, parce que c'est mon genre. . . ." Voir Grimm, *Correspondance*, éd. Tourneux, t. 16, p. 221.

¹² Voir Lanson, *Nivelle de la Chaussée*, Paris, 1887, pp. 267 et suiv. Il est significatif que, pour réfuter la thèse de Rousseau, le marquis de Ximénès choisit précisément divers exemples dans la comédie larmoyante. Voir Moffat, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

dirait l'attitude officielle de Rousseau au moment où il écrit sa lettre. Mais tâchons de découvrir ce qu'il pensait vraiment des genres nouveaux.

Dans beaucoup d'endroits de la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, et presque involontairement, il trahit une secrète préférence pour le drame bourgeois. Sur un point capital d'abord. Ayant constaté qu'au théâtre "l'objet principal est de plaire," il continue, comme à regret, en disant: "Cela seul empêchera toujours qu'on ne puisse donner à ces sortes d'établissements *tous les avantages dont ils seroient susceptibles*."¹³ Voilà une concession qui peut mener loin. En effet, si jusqu'ici le but du théâtre avait bien été de plaire, la sensibilité ayant transformé les goûts du public, on entend dire de tous les côtés, et de plus en plus haut, que le but du théâtre doit être moral. L'objet principal n'est plus de plaire, il s'agit d'instruire.¹⁴

Au point de vue théorique il est donc incontestable que le but moral assigné au théâtre devait convenir beaucoup mieux à Rousseau. Mais il avait déclaré aussi qu'il était impossible de réussir au théâtre sans flatter les passions et les préjugés régnants. "Qu'on mette, pour voir, dit-il, sur la scène française un homme droit et vertueux, mais simple et grossier, . . . sans amour, sans galanterie, et qui ne fasse pas de belles phrases; qu'on y mette un sage sans préjugés, qui, ayant reçu un affront d'un spadassin, refuse de s'aller faire égorger par l'offenseur; . . . j'aurai tort si l'on réussit."¹⁵ Ce "sage sans préjugés," imaginé par Rousseau, n'est-ce pas le héros de la comédie de Sedaine, *le Philosophe sans le savoir* (1765)?¹⁶ Or, ce drame ayant eu un succès prolongé, Rousseau avait tort.

Nous avons d'autres indications, plus précises encore. Rousseau a lu *le Fils naturel* de Diderot et a écrit à Ustéri qu'il le trouvait "tout à fait beau." De plus il connaissait *le Marchand de Londres*, cette pièce de Lillo où Diderot trouvait réalisées ses conceptions du drame bourgeois. Et Rousseau, aussi enthousiaste que Diderot,

¹³ *Lettre sur les spectacles*, p. 26.

¹⁴ M. Gaiffe dit que vers 1735 "le comique n'est plus en effet le but essentiel de la comédie; moraliser, analyser, émouvoir, voilà qui paraît désormais plus important que de faire rire." *Le rire* etc. p. 135. Voir aussi Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 116 et suiv.

¹⁵ *Lettre sur les Spectacles*, p. 32 (note de Rousseau).

¹⁶ Le premier titre de ce drame était "Le duel."

déclare que c'est "une pièce admirable, et dont la morale va plus directement au but qu'aucune pièce française que je connaisse."¹⁷

Ainsi il est manifeste que Rousseau n'adresse pas au drame bourgeois les mêmes critiques qu'aux genres établis. Des deux pièces sur lesquelles il porte un jugement il déclare l'une "tout à fait belle" et l'autre "admirable."¹⁸

Une dernière remarque s'impose. En appréciant les critiques de Rousseau on oublie trop de tenir compte de ce qu'elles contiennent de "républicain." Et cependant il est très évident que c'est le libre citoyen de la République de Genève, dont il se pose en défenseur, qui critique la société et la monarchie françaises. Ce qui lui déplaît dans les spectacles, plus encore que l'immoralité, c'est la leçon politique qui s'en dégage. On y fait admirer au peuple les crimes des rois et on l'invite à applaudir le mépris que montrent, pour les bourgeois et les paysans, des nobles orgueilleux et fripons. Sont-ce là les spectacles qu'il convient d'introduire chez un peuple qui a su conserver sa liberté? Que ce fût là le grief principal de Rousseau contre le théâtre français, c'est ce que nous affirme celui de ses disciples qui l'a le mieux connu personnellement. "Il fit la guerre à notre théâtre, dit Mercier, d'abord parce qu'il ressembloit au gouvernement. . . . Son ouvrage *sur les spectacles* veut nous dire d'un bout à l'autre que la tragédie nationale n'appartient qu'à un peuple libre, et que nos compositions théâtrales sentent l'école de la servitude. . . ."¹⁹

De toutes ces considérations il ressort clairement que Rousseau, souffrant encore de sa récente brouille avec Diderot, a forcé le ton de la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, entraîné qu'il était par son patriotisme genevois et sa haine pour Voltaire. Que tel ait été son cas, il n'a pas hésité à l'avouer à un de ses amis.²⁰

Il est d'ailleurs facile de confirmer cette thèse en rapprochant des idées exprimées dans la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, celles qu'il prête

¹⁷ *Lettre sur les spectacles*, p. 88 (Note de Rousseau ajoutée à l'édition de 1782).

¹⁸ Tout ceci est d'ailleurs fort naturel et Louis Riccoboni (1675-1753) qui avant Rousseau avait fait le procès des genres établis, avait lui aussi été un des premiers à porter aux nues le genre larmoyant, à son époque une révolution audacieuse. Voir Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

¹⁹ *De Jean Jacques Rousseau*, Paris, 1791, t. 1, p. 14.

²⁰ Voir *Correspondance générale*, t. 4, p. 153. (Lettre à Vernet du 18 déc. 1758).

à Saint-Preux dans *la Nouvelle Héloïse* dont la composition est antérieure à la querelle avec Diderot. Au lieu de représenter les combats de l'amour et de la vertu chez Sertorius, Pompée ou d'autres héros anciens, Saint-Preux voudrait que les tragédies contribuent à exciter dans les spectateurs l'amour de la patrie et de la liberté. La comédie, au lieu de reproduire "les conversations d'une centaine de maisons de Paris," devrait "représenter au naturel les mœurs du peuple," de tout le peuple, non celles d'une poignée d'impertinents "en habit doré" qui considèrent les bourgeois et les hommes du peuple comme des gens d'un autre monde.²¹ En somme, ce que demande Saint-Preux, c'est que la tragédie soit nationale et la comédie populaire, ou, si l'on veut, bourgeoise.

De tout ceci retenons que dans *la Nouvelle Héloïse* Rousseau se montre très proche des théories de Diderot et que même dans la *Lettre à d'Alembert* on peut sentir, derrière les attaques contre les genres établis, une certaine préférence pour ce qu'on a appelé le genre sérieux. En définitive, Rousseau est moins l'ennemi du théâtre en général qu'opposé à l'établissement des spectacles à Genève; il nie la valeur morale du théâtre, mais c'est avant tout l'immoralité des genres traditionnels qu'il attaque. Cependant, comme il y aura toujours des spectacles à Paris, il vaudrait encore mieux qu'ils soient réformés suivant les suggestions de Saint-Preux.

La *Lettre à d'Alembert* a-t-elle favorisé ou retardé l'évolution naturelle du théâtre? En s'attachant uniquement aux réponses immédiates des philosophes offensés on a manqué de voir combien elle secondait les efforts des réformateurs. Après 1760 le drame représente la partie vivante du théâtre. Or, qu'est-ce que ce drame? Il est d'abord l'héritier de la Chaussée qui, à certains points de vue commença, comme dit Lanson, "l'œuvre que devait achever Rousseau."²² C'est le genre aussi qui, comme l'affirme M. Gaiffe, "va s'employer durant toute la fin du siècle à glorifier le sauvage et l'homme de la nature, à exalter les classes laborieuses, à revendiquer l'égalité des conditions et des sexes . . . et à saper tous les préjugés sociaux."²³ Il est donc clair que le drame va essentiellement chercher à porter sur la scène les principes défendus par Rousseau. Dès lors il n'y a pas lieu de s'étonner que les partisans du genre nouveau soient en même temps des disciples de Rousseau.

²¹ Voir *Nouvelle Héloïse*, éd. Mornet, t. 2, pp. 338-342; IIe partie, Lettre 17.

²² *Op. cit.* p. 147.

²³ Voir Gaiffe, *Le rire*, p. 152.

Marmontel, d'Alembert et quelques autres s'étaient empressés de protester contre les idées de Rousseau. Mais une dizaine d'années plus tard, alors que les divers auteurs dont nous avons cité la liste plus haut entrèrent en jeu, ils acceptèrent sans hésitation ce qui avait tellement révolté les ennemis de Rousseau en 1758.²⁴ Nous ne voulons pas reprendre séparément les idées de chacun de ces novateurs, ce qui serait bien inutile puisque, comme l'a déjà constaté Miss Moffat, ils se montrent tous d'accord avec Rousseau auquel ils empruntent leurs arguments. En effet, bien que d'une manière générale ils soient les continuateurs de Diderot, sur les points principaux, qu'il s'agisse de la critique des genres établis ou des principes du théâtre nouveau, ils se révèlent les vrais disciples de Rousseau.

Thorel de Campigneulles et Nouel de Buzonnière furent les premiers à reprendre les idées de Rousseau pour les mettre au service de leur thèse, la réforme morale du théâtre.²⁵ Mais laissons ces auteurs, oubliés aujourd'hui, pour en venir tout de suite à Beaumarchais. Dans *l'Essai sur le genre dramatique sérieux* (1767) il semble développer les théories de Diderot. On connaît la fameuse tirade contre la tragédie: "Que me font à moi, s'écrie-t-il, sujet paisible d'un Etat monarchique du 18^e siècle, les révolutions d'Athènes et de Rome? Quel intérêt véritable puis-je prendre . . . au sacrifice d'une princesse en Aulide? Il n'y a dans tout cela . . . aucune moralité qui me convienne."²⁶ Ce qu'on sait moins, c'est que cette déclaration lui est inspirée non par Diderot, mais par Rousseau. En effet, elle est précédée d'une citation de la *Lettre à d'Alembert* dont elle n'est qu'un développement audacieux.²⁷ Le

²⁴ Mercier est très conscient de cette différence entre les philosophes ennemis de Rousseau et les auteurs de la nouvelle génération. Parlant des réponses à la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, il dit: "Ceux qui voulurent alors lui répondre n'étoient pas nés ou formés pour le comprendre; un goût timide et resserré courboit alors toute la littérature. Des académies entières combattirent Rousseau, et Rousseau a dû sentir quelques mouvemens d'orgueil, en voyant les préjugés les plus misérables dominer des hommes qui vouloient combattre tous les autres préjugés; ce respect superstitieux qu'ils reprochoient à tant de fanatiques, ils le conservoient pour des formes puériles auxquelles ils étoient accoutumés." *De Jean Jacques Rousseau*, t. 1, p. 14 et suiv. A ce sujet voir la thèse de R. Lowenstein, *Voltaire as an Historian of 17th Century French Drama*, Baltimore, 1935.

²⁵ Voir Moffat, *op. cit.* pp. 234-241.

²⁶ Cet essai sert de préface à la pièce intitulée *Eugénie*. Voir *Théâtre de Beaumarchais*, éd. Auger, Paris, 1857, p. 6.

²⁷ Voici le passage de Rousseau que cite Beaumarchais: "Ne seroit-il pas

cas de Sébastien Mercier est encore plus net. C'est lui-même qui nous apprend que son *Nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique* (1773) a été composé directement sous l'influence de Rousseau. Cet aveu est précieux, mais il était inutile. Nous sentons bien que Mercier n'est que l'écho de Saint-Preux lorsqu'il dit que la tragédie française est devenue "une sorte de farce sérieuse, écrite avec pompe, qui vise à satisfaire l'oreille, mais qui ne dit rien à la nation."²⁸

On n'est pas plus indulgent pour la comédie et personne ne vient prendre la défense de Molière contre Rousseau.²⁹ Au contraire, tous s'accordent à reprocher au grand comique d'avoir attaqué seulement les ridicules tandis que le but du théâtre doit être "de faire, comme dit Buzonnière, une guerre ouverte aux vices qui désolent la société, inspirer aux spectateurs des sentiments de vertu, et leur faire . . . aimer leur Patrie."³⁰ Le seul point qu'on accorde à Molière, et là encore on ne fait que répéter Rousseau, c'est qu'il a osé peindre "des bourgeois et des artisans aussi bien que des marquis" alors que ses imitateurs ne savent que reproduire au théâtre les conversations du beau monde.³¹

Que fallait-il mettre à la place des comédies que l'on condamnait? Rousseau en avait parlé beaucoup moins. Cependant il est aisé de deviner à quelles sortes de pièces allaient ses préférences. "Le savoir, avait-il écrit, l'esprit, le courage, ont seuls notre admiration, et toi, douce et modeste vertu, tu restes toujours sans honneurs."³² Que fait Beaumarchais? Il veut mettre en scène "la vertu persécutée, victime de la méchanceté, mais toujours belle . . . et préférable à tout."³³ Rousseau s'était-il plaint qu'au théâtre on ne sortît jamais des sphères aristocratiques de la société, qu'on n'y représentât rien qui pût plaire au peuple, il n'y avait qu'à faire le contraire. Ainsi Mercier déclare qu'un "drame, quelque parfait qu'on

à désirer que nos sublimes auteurs daignassent descendre un peu de leur continuelle élévation, et nous attendrir quelquefois sur la simple humanité souffrante, de peur que, n'ayant de pitié que pour des héros malheureux, nous n'en ayons jamais pour personne?" Voir *Lettre sur les spectacles*, p. 50.

²⁸ *Du théâtre, ou Nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique*, pp. 29-30; voir aussi *Nouvelles Héloïse*, IIe partie, Lettre 17 (éd. Mornet, t. 2, p. 343).

²⁹ Sur l'impopularité de Molière à cette époque, voir Gaiffe, *Le rire*, pp. 137-138.

³⁰ Cité dans Moffat, *op. cit.* p. 336.

³¹ Voir Mercier, *Du théâtre*, p. 78; *Nouvelle Héloïse*, IIe partie, Lettre 17.

³² *Lettre à d'Alembert*, p. 45.

³³ *Op. cit.* pp. 10-11.

le suppose, ne sauroit trop être à la portée du peuple; il ne pourroit même paroître parfait qu'en parlant éloquemment à la multitude."³⁴ Ailleurs il demande que le drame peigne les "mœurs actuelles de notre époque," qu'il plonge jusque "dans l'intérieur de nos maisons," bref, qu'il soit essentiellement "le tableau du siècle."³⁵

"Le plaisir même du comique étant, d'après Rousseau, fondé sur un vice du cœur humain," tous ces réformateurs déclarèrent que le rire n'aura pas de place dans le drame. Pour rendre l'homme meilleur, il ne faut pas l'amuser, il faut le toucher. Ayant vu "la vertu persécutée," "je sors du spectacle, affirme Beaumarchais, meilleur que je n'y suis entré, par cela seul que j'ai été attendri."³⁶ Disons enfin que le *Philinte de Molière* (1790), de Fabre d'Eglantine, loin d'être un phénomène isolé, n'est que l'aboutissement d'une longue évolution. Dès 1758 les sujets dont Molière tirait des comédies avaient servi à faire des drames, pathétiques et attendrissants.³⁷ C'est donc bien simple, pour réformer le théâtre il s'agit d'employer sur la scène les moyens dont Rousseau avait usé avec tant de succès dans le roman.

Le rire et la gaîté éliminés au profit des larmes et de l'émotion, la correction des vices remplaçant celle des ridicules, et la peinture des classes moyennes et même des humbles, substituée à celle du monde aristocratique, voilà les réformes qu'on réclame et ce sont celles précisément que Rousseau avait demandées.

En conclusion rappelons que cette étude ne cherche aucunement à prouver que Rousseau fût le théoricien le plus important du drame. Tout ce que nous avons voulu montrer c'est qu'il y a, au sujet du théâtre, une parenté étroite entre ses idées et celles de Diderot. Cela est tout à fait évident si on se reporte à *la Nouvelle Héloïse* et c'est vrai aussi, jusqu'à un certain point, même de la *Lettre à d'Alembert* écrite après la rupture avec Diderot. Cela étant, les réformateurs du théâtre auraient pu, cela va de soi, se réclamer de l'un ou de l'autre. Mais il est certain que c'est à Rousseau plutôt qu'à Diderot qu'ils ont cherché à se rattacher.

EMANUEL VON DER MÜHLL

Wilson College, Chambersburg

³⁴ *Du théâtre*, p. 200.

³⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 103.

³⁶ *Op. cit.* pp. 10-11.

³⁷ Voir à ce sujet Gaiffe, *Le drame au 18^e siècle*, pp. 102-103.

AN EARLY FRENCH ADAPTATION OF AN ELIZABETHAN
COMEDY: J. B. ROUSSEAU AS AN IMITATOR
OF BEN JONSON

Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, that almost forgotten eighteenth-century poet, who was known as "le grand Rousseau" in the days before his reputation began to slip, owed his vogue mainly to his lyric poetry. Even in the time of his greatest renown he was considered a failure as a dramatist. That is probably the main reason why his posthumous play *L'Hypocondre, ou la femme qui ne parle point* has attracted little attention. He wrote it toward the end of his life, about 1733, and in that year, the following year and as late as 1739, two years before his death, he tried to arouse the interest of his friends and through them of the directors of the *Comédie française* in this new comedy, but in vain. One of the poet's friends, the abbé Séguy, when he published a posthumous edition of his works, apparently judged *L'Hypocondre* unworthy of being printed. It did not appear until 1751, when the so-called *Portefeuille de J.-B. Rousseau* was issued. It attracted no attention whatever and has not since. And yet this forgotten play is of considerable interest to us today: it is one of the first French imitations of an Elizabethan dramatist; the first French adaptation of a play by Ben Jonson.¹

It is fairly well known that J. B. Rousseau had some contact with England and things English. He was in England twice, in 1698-1699² and in 1722-1723. It is not known whether he had any knowledge of the English language, but it is certain that he had some knowledge of English literature as early as 1716. In that year, in a letter to Brossette, he said, speaking of English plays:

It est vrai qu'il n'y a ni rime ni raison dans toutes leurs pièces, de la manière qu'elles sont bâties, mais j'en ai vu plusieurs qui ne laisseraient pas de pouvoir servir de canevas à d'excellentes comédies, si elles étaient bien traitées.³

¹ It should be noted that parts of Saint-Evremond's *Sir Politik Would-be* (ca. 1662) are inspired by Ben Jonson's *Volpone*.

² If we are to believe a letter of Rousseau to Brossette (*Corresp. de J. B. Rousseau et de Brossette*, Paris, 1910, 2 vols., I, 90.), he met Saint-Evremond during his first visit to England. His first knowledge of Jonson may have come from Saint-Evremond.

³ *Correspondance de J. B. Rousseau et de Brossette*, I, 35.

The attitude expressed in the lines just quoted may explain partly why Rousseau wrote *L'Hypocondre*. The actual circumstances of its composition are given as follows by the editor of the *Portefeuille de J.-B. Rousseau*:

La comédie qu'on vient de lire est anglaise. Feu M. D***, gentilhomme anglais, homme d'esprit et d'érudition, à qui elle plaisait fort, l'a traduite en français pour la faire connaître à M. Rousseau, et le pria de la mettre en vers. Après l'avoir examinée, M. Rousseau en a changé tout le plan, pour tâcher de l'accommoder à notre théâtre . . .⁴

The English comedy which M. D*** had translated for Jean-Baptiste Rousseau and upon which he based his *Hypocondre* is Ben Jonson's *Epicoene, or the Silent Woman*. *The Silent Woman*, produced in 1609 or 1610, is the gayest of Jonson's comedies and has remained the most popular, if not the best-known and the most admired.

The play centers around Morose, an eccentric bachelor who has a horror of noise of all sorts and who takes ridiculous precautions to ensure silence around him. Morose has a nephew named Sir Dauphine Eugenie, whom he hates. He would like to marry and have an heir merely to disinherit his nephew, but he dreads the noise a wife would bring into the house. At the start of the play we learn, from a conversation between Dauphine and his friends Clerimont and Truewit, that Morose's barber Cutbeard has discovered a suitable wife for Morose, a silent young woman, and that this silent woman is to be presented to Morose that very day. Morose makes his first appearance on the stage at the beginning of the second act, and his extravagant obsession is shown, as well as his amusing method of having his servants communicate to him without words. Truewit then bursts in and deluges Morose with a torrent of words in which he warns of the dire consequences of marrying. This makes Morose all the more determined, for he believes that Truewit has come in the interests of Dauphine. On Truewit's return to Dauphine we learn that the silent woman, whose name, incidentally, is Epicoene, is closely associated with the nephew, who is thus actually encouraging the marriage. Neither the audience nor the other characters are informed at that point as to the reason for this paradoxical situation. Epicoene is presented to Morose by the barber, and makes an excellent impression, remaining silent, or at most, murmuring a few words inaudibly. The marriage takes place in the third act, and immediately after it Epicoene changes; she begins to talk loudly, to assert herself, to give orders—all to the consternation of Morose. Truewit then reappears and, pretending to console Morose, overwhelms him again with a flood of words. At this point, to make Morose's despair complete, the machinations of Dauphine bring

⁴ *Portefeuille de J. B. Rousseau*, Amsterdam, 1751, 2 vols., I, 379.

about the invasion of the hypochondriac's house by various comic characters, who have been previously introduced. For the remainder of the third act and most of the fourth the house is in tumult and Morose is frantic. Determined to get a divorce, he accepts the aid of Truewit, who offers to furnish legal advice. So, in the fifth act, Truewit produces Otter (a comic friend of his) and Cutbeard, disguised one as a theologian, the other as a lawyer, and with scraps of bad Latin they review before Morose the grounds for divorce, going so far as to persuade him to ask for one based upon grounds of impotence. They end up, however, by finding no satisfactory grounds, and Morose is at his wits' end. Dauphine then offers to find a solution if Morose will give him an annuity and promise of inheritance. As soon as Morose has signed the papers, Dauphine reveals that Epicœne is a man, and that hence the marriage is null.

This play, because of the conception of comedy upon which it is based (that is, a central figure who is ridiculous because he represents some trait of character carried to an extreme), is closest to Molière of all of Jonson's plays. Rousseau was violently opposed to the tendencies of French comedy about 1730, when Destouches, La Chaussée and Marivaux were reigning favorites; he was anxious to guide the French comic muse back to what he felt was the true comic tradition: that represented by Molière. As we examine the manner in which he adapted Jonson's comedy we must keep that fact in mind.

The French poet kept the name Morose for the main character, called the nephew Léandre, suppressed Clerimont, and called Truewit Eutrapel. Epicœne was changed to Androgyné, which may have seemed to the French poet to have a more easily grasped significance. The minor characters were cut down in numbers and were linked more closely to the main characters.

In general, as the changes made with regard to the characters suggest, the plot of the French play is simpler than the source, Rousseau obviously having decided to eliminate everything that seemed to him to violate the unities. Although the first acts of both plays contain the same amount of exposition, Rousseau did not keep Jonson's opening scene, in which Clerimont, Truewit and Dauphine converse wittily and entertainingly and bring in Morose and the situation involving him only incidentally and gradually. This may have seemed to the French poet to violate Boileau's rule:

Que dès les premiers vers l'action préparée
Sans peine du sujet aplanisse l'entrée.

(*Art poétique*, III).

He substituted for this opening scene a monologue by the barber, followed by a scene between the barber and the nephew, both of which stick pretty much to exposition. There is a significant difference at the end of the first act. In Jonson's play, Truewit and the others coöperate with Dauphine mainly out of pure love of mischief, and, along with the audience, are kept in the dark with regard to the most important detail of Dauphine's plot (that is, the real nature of *Epicene*). In Rousseau's version the first act ends with Léandre promising, as he leaves the stage with Eutrapel, to give the details of the plot, which he does between the acts. These are not revealed to the audience, although the name *Androgyne* might serve as a fairly good clue.

In the second acts of both plays, the three most important scenes are similar: that is, the scenes between Morose and his servant, between Morose and his nephew's friend and the scene where the barber introduces the silent woman to Morose. It goes almost without saying that Rousseau maintains the unity of place, and thus is obliged to omit one of Jonson's scenes, that which takes place in Sir John Daw's house.

In the third and fourth acts the two plays are similar as far as the general lines of the plot go, but there are considerable differences in the details of the action. Rousseau has simplified a great deal. He certainly found a lack of unity of action, as he understood it, in Jonson's play. He would have decided that many details based upon conditions of London life in the Elizabethan period would have been unintelligible and probably repugnant to any French audience. He therefore suppressed such details, but he endeavored to keep the most important comic devices found in the third and fourth acts of his source: the sudden change in the silent woman, the ludicrous distress and frenzy of Morose, the hubbub caused by the invasion of uninvited guests. He kept whatever comic details of Jonson's he judged suitable and added others of his own of far from negligible quality to replace those he suppressed.

The highly effective and comic fifth act of Jonson was adapted by Rousseau with little change. The French poet shortened it—especially by cutting down greatly the amount of Latin used by the supposed authorities on divorce whom Morose consults. It is interesting to note that he also gave his Morose a little more dignity: his Morose protests more violently against being obliged to

confess impotence and refuses to admit it in words, instead he signs reluctantly a confession of impotence dictated to him.

From this comparison, it is seen that, in all essential portions of the action, Rousseau followed Jonson as closely as he thought the French rules would allow, with the exception of the detail mentioned above concerning the revelation of Dauphine's plot to the other characters. Rousseau possibly decided that the behavior of Eutrapel and the women would not be sufficiently motivated, hence not *vraisemblable*, if it were not made clear that they were consciously coöperating in Léandre's plot. The parts suppressed by the French poet were parts which, amusing in themselves, were not essential to the development of the plot and hence violated the unity of action.

As far as the character of Morose goes—in Rousseau's mind certainly the most important feature of the play—the original was reproduced carefully, with the exception of one curious point. At the end, when Epicône's identity is revealed, Jonson's Morose exits without a word, whereas Rousseau's delivers a final tirade in which he reviles the characters who have made a game of him, but declares himself satisfied anyway, as he is certain now that he can have rest and quiet. This seems in line with the French author's apparent desire to keep the character of Morose unchanged and intact (as Molière would have done), but to allow him to maintain a certain amount of dignity.

When we consider the matter of similarities of detail in the two plays, we must remark at once that Rousseau's play, even in scenes that correspond exactly, is in no way a translation of Jonson's. It should be remembered that the English play is in prose, and the French in verse, in regular Alexandrines. Furthermore, although, as far as language went, considerably greater freedom was permitted in French comedy than in French tragedy, there is a great and fundamental difference between rich, vigorous, earthy Elizabethan prose and classical French verse, even when the latter is taken in its familiar and realistic moments. Hence, the closest Rousseau came to his English source is in making use of specific ideas or themes within scenes that correspond in function. For instance, the scene in the second act, where Truewit (Eutrapel) comes in to badger Morose with an unsolicited warning against marriage, is similar in the two plays. The following parallel passages show the use Jean Baptiste made of details found in Jonson:

THE SILENT WOMAN

TRUEWIT:

They say you are to marry; to marry! do you mark, sir?

MOROSE:

How then, rude companion!

TRUEWIT:

Marry, your friends do wonder, sir, the Thames being so near, wherein you may drown so handsomely; or London Bridge at a low fall, with a fine leap, to hurry you down stream; or, such a delicate steeple in the town, as Bow, to vault from; or, a braver height, as Paul's. Or, if you affected to do it nearer home, and a shorter way, an excellent garret-window into the street; or, a beam in the said garret, with this halter—(*shows him the halter*)— . . . any way rather than follow this goblin matrimony.

(Act II, Scene i)

L'HYPONCONDRE

EUTRAPEL:

Vous prétendez, dit-on, vous marier en forme!

Vous marier! vous, vous!

MOROSE:

Ah, quelle voix énorme!

EUTRAPEL:

Comme si dans Paris vous manquiez de secours

Pour abrégér le fil de vos malheureux jours!

Que la Seine, épuisée et tarie en sa source,

Ne vous pût de ses flots présenter la ressource;

Ou que vous n'eussiez pas, si c'est votre plaisir,

Pour vous précipiter cent clochers à choisir!

Vous marier, morbleu!

(Act II, Scene ii)

From the passages quoted we see that Rousseau took from Jonson two of the suggested methods of suicide, but that he altered them, while adapting them, of course, to Paris. He simplified and shortened; of concrete local references he used only two—Paris and Seine—, as against four in Jonson—Thames, London Bridge, Bow and Paul's. Moreover, instead of using the French equivalent of the specific verb "to drown," he used a circumlocution, speaking of the Seine as a "ressource pour abrégér le fil de vos malheureux jours." It should be noted that the adaptation is by no means unskillful; the passage is clear, the rhythm flows easily. Rousseau should not be condemned for making use of circumlocution; it would be incorrect to say that all circumlocutions are bad: this one is clear and presents an image. Eutrapel's speech in Rousseau's play lacks some of the racy, picturesque vigor of Truewit's in *the Silent Woman*, but it has qualities of its own that are not negligible.

In short, *L'Hypocondre* is a respectable adaptation of a very good English comedy. At the time it was written, however, and for long afterwards, Rousseau's effort was, if noticed at all, treated as

beneath contempt, a thing that had better not be mentioned and that should be forgotten as quickly as possible.⁵ Hence it passed into oblivion, an oblivion so complete that though recent English editors of Jonson's works mention the fact that a "bad French translation" of *the Silent Woman* was said to have been made in the eighteenth century,⁶ they are unable to give further precisions.

HENRY A. GRUBBS

Princeton University

SOME NOTES ON EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ESSEX PLAYS

The following notes are but a supplement to Mr. T. M. H. Blair's edition of John Banks's *The Unhappy Favourite*, recently published.¹ In his introduction, notes, and appendix Mr. Blair has provided this pathetic tragedy with the explanatory apparatus deserved by a play that for well over a hundred years seldom failed to draw tears from an audience, "I mean those whose Souls were capable of so Noble a pleasure." Nevertheless, a few points may still be made in connection with eighteenth-century versions of *The Unhappy Favourite*. I should like to offer these notes on the adaptations by Ralph, Jones, and Brooke, and particularly on the Larpent manuscripts of the last two.

1.

Concerning James Ralph's *The Fall of the Earl of Essex* (1731), Mr. Blair indicates those points in the last act in which it differs

⁵ This was Voltaire's opinion, expressed in a letter of 1752, in which he was apparently trying to be fair to J. B. Rousseau. In fact, he said that he thought the play must have been published by an enemy of Rousseau's who was endeavoring to discredit his memory. (See *Œuvres de Voltaire*, ed. Moland, xxxvii, 411). The only contemporary who is known to have expressed a favorable opinion of *L'Hypocondre* was Titon du Tillet (a good friend of J. B. Rousseau). In *La Suite du Parnasse français* (1743, p. 753), speaking of Rousseau's plays, he referred to *L'Hypocondre* as "la seule qui n'est point imprimée et qui mérite fort de l'être, par la singularité des caractères des acteurs et par la beauté de la versification."

⁶ See, for instance, *The Best Plays of Ben Jonson* (Mermaid Series), London, Unwin, n. d. III, 146.

¹ John Banks, *The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex*, edited with an Introduction and Notes by Thomas Marshall Howe Blair. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

most remarkably from other English and French renderings of the story, noting that "Ralph begins the scene [V, i] by showing Elizabeth in disguise about to visit Essex in the Tower"; and that, at the end of the play, "Ralph provides details which are unique and striking," having the body of Essex brought upon the stage in a coffin, by which the Countess of Rutland kneels and "Elizabeth exclaims that it is

. . . a Sight that startles Nature, and distracts
The Mind with Horror."³

It may be worth observing that in these two details Ralph is in accord in the handling of the conclusion of the story with the first dramatist known to have used the material (without the ring theme), Antonio Coello, whose *El Conde de Sex* (performed 1633, printed, Barcelona, 1638) preceded La Calprenède's tragedy by five years. In Coello's *El Conde de Sex, ó Dar la Vida por su Dama* the Queen, disguised, actually visits the condemned traitor in his prison; and at the end the corpse of Essex is shown upon the stage.³ Of course, Ralph might have arrived independently at these devices to heighten the effect of his last act; but it is not too rash to suggest that he may have known some version of the Spanish play or some derivative from it.⁴

2.

Henry Jones's *The Earl of Essex* (1753) was the second eighteenth-century version to appear in London, and it became the favorite

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 110, 117.

⁴ See Antonio Coello, *El Conde de Sex, ó Dar la Vida por su Dama*, *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, vol. 45: "Dramáticos Contemporáneos de Lope de Vega" (ed. Ramón de Mesonero Romanos, Madrid, 1858), II, 403-420; and Emilio Cotarelo, "Dramáticos del Siglo XVII: Don Antonio Coello y Ochoa," *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, V (1918), 550. (I am indebted to my colleague, Professor Sturgis E. Leavitt, for references to Coello.) See also Winifred Smith, "The Earl of Essex on the Stage," *PMLA.*, XXXIX (1924), 147-173.

⁵ Winifred Smith, *op. cit.*, has described Italian versions derived from Coello, one, by Niccolò Biancolelli, as early as 1668, and "*commedia dell'arte* variants." Miss Smith is unable to suggest Coello's source; but she observes that "there is at least a possibility that the Spaniard, Antonio Perez, in London and intimately acquainted with Essex in 1595 . . . may have been the retailer of some of the facts of the tragic story." (P. 149, n. 4.)

arrangement of the story on the eighteenth-century stage. *The Dramatic Censor*, twenty years later, described the play, compared it with other versions, and advanced these conclusions:

This tragedy, being founded on historical fact, and that domestic also, has particular influence upon a British audience; the plot is regular, the scenes well ranged, and the characters naturally drawn; the language is chaste, the versification harmonious and expressive; and the sentiments instructive; it is less bombastic, and more natural than Banks's; not so nervous or sentimental as Brooke's play, on the same subject, but more consonant to general apprehension and taste; it certainly does not deserve the stile of a capital performance, but, as we think, may very properly stand the test of perusal and performance.⁵

As Mr. Blair says,⁶ "The abstract quality of much of its phraseology, together with the regularity and balance of the lines, undoubtedly made it appeal to eighteenth-century audiences"; and it did indeed prove "to be the most popular of all." In this version considerable emphasis is placed upon the struggle between Burleigh and Essex, and the Queen's part is correspondingly minimized. Burleigh is presented more nearly as a villain actively trying to ruin Essex than, as in Banks, merely an opportunist, profiting from Essex' mistakes. Though pitched in a lower emotional key, Jones's play contains less narrative dialogue than its predecessors, events are somewhat better concatenated, and the whole is more smoothly conducted. These virtues may, perhaps, be credited to the experienced player and the accomplished gentleman who aided in the composition of the play.

Jones has acknowledged a debt to Colley Cibber and Lord Chesterfield; and the chaste language, harmonious and expressive versification, and instructive sentiments that led Gentleman to praise this tragedy above its rivals are not apparent in the earliest version of Jones's play that I know, that found in the Larpent manuscript.⁷ First, it should be noted that the manuscript was sent to the Examiner of Plays for license by John Rich on February 14, 1750/51, two years before the play was produced and printed. This manuscript gives a text of the play much less polished than that printed; it shows crudities of language, rough verse, and

⁵ [Francis Gentleman,] *The Dramatic Censor* (London, 1770), II, 234-235.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 127.

⁷ Concerning the Larpent manuscripts see *Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, San Marino, California, 1939.

impassioned, incoherent utterance by the characters,—all features that were eliminated before the copy was given to the printer. In some instances this version is closer to the text of Banks than the printed text, in others less close. The nature of these revisions is shown in the scene in which Rutland reveals to the Queen her marriage to Essex. The printed text is quoted by Mr. Blair^a to show the various handlings of this scene. In the manuscript Jones's scene is closer to Banks in ideas and feeling. Thus:

Queen	Husband. Confusion, Ha—
Rutland	I will not let thee go The throbbing Infant pleads, the Mother begs The Babe unborn beseeches in the Womb To spare its Fathers precious life if e'er Thy soul Shall mercy need bestow it now Preserve the fruit of our encreasing Loves And save my Essex life O save him, save him.
Queen	Away—Tare off her hold—
Rutland	O Gracious Queen, He ever loved—was ever Loyale Brave Your Conqu'ring Essex— The mortal minutes come— If nature dwells about your heart—Oh spurn me not My murder'd Lord; my Love—my Husband bleeds Relentless Queen—the Tomb's prepar'd—my Child, One Tomb shall to its cold embrace receive us— O yet—for pity sake—let go your hands. I'll hang upon her bend her heart to Grace Nay force me not—Inhuman Wretches. 'Mercy Oh! Mercy!

Exit Rutland forc'd off

As the passage quoted by Mr. Blair shows, the throbbing infant, the rugged violence, the broken lines, and the needless alexandrine are all gone from the final version.

The lines that precede the tag of the last act further illustrate the difference. In the manuscript they are:

Queen	Support me providence!—ye Guardian Spirits Lend me your Sacred Aid—your Charge attend Sustain this dreadful Blow—Detested Woman! [Nottingham] Malignant Wretch! O Injur'd hapless Essex! All Gracious Heav'n, how vain is human Wisdom Oppos'd to thy Unchangeable Decree
-------	--

^a *Op. cit.*, p. 106.

Whose perfect providence Iust Means Imloys
 Beyond the weak Extent of Human sight
 For Mystic Bounty and the Wisest Ends

As printed, the lines become

O barbarous Woman!
 Surrounded still by Treachery and Fraud!
 What bloody deed is this? Thou injur'd Essex!
 My Fame is soil'd to all succeeding Times:
 But Heav'n alone can view the breaking Heart;
 Then let its will be done.—

Obviously, some one has touched up Jones's verses. Perhaps they were revised by Chesterfield and Cibber between the time that the license was granted and the appearance of the piece on the stage.

The continued use of the printed version is shown by its inclusion in 1808 in Mrs. Inchbald's edition, which reprints with only a few omissions here and there the text of Dodsley's edition of 1753. The text of the Larpent manuscript may have been used on the stage originally; but I doubt it, even though there is no evidence among the Larpent plays that the final text was submitted for license. Certainly, licensed or not, the smoother text became the standard.

3.

The version of Henry Brooke's adaptation of *The Unhappy Favourite* that was used in Dublin in 1750 seems to have disappeared, but one may suspect that it differed from that published in London in 1761.⁹ This latter is a condensed paraphrase of Banks, following the original closely until the last act.¹⁰ There the farewell between the condemned Essex and the pardoned Southampton is worked up; and that between Essex and his wife is toned down. But, in a new scene that has no counterpart in the earlier versions, Lady Rutland goes quite mad. This scene replaces the reconciliation of Elizabeth and Rutland provided by Banks at this point. Despite the mad secondary heroine, however, Brooke gives the final moments to the Queen, though he stresses her personal grief rather than the inconveniences of royal station, in the concluding lines:

⁹ With some minor changes, the 1761 text was also included in *A Collection of Pieces . . . by Henry Brooke, Esq.* (4 vols., London, 1778.)

¹⁰ See Blair, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-110, 124-125.

Cecil, thou dost not know what thou hast done—

Pronounc'd sentence of death upon thy Queen.

Cecil—I will no more ascend my throne,

The humble floor shall serve me; here I'll sit

With moaping melancholy my companion,

'Till death unmark'd approach, to steal me to my grave.

Cecil—I never more will close these eyes

In sleep, nor taste of food—and Cecil now,

Mark me—You hear Elizabeth's last words.

From this have been removed all questions of statecraft (such as are found in Banks) and all indications of moral lessons (so prominent in Jones), to give the stage entirely to two pathetic women, undone by the villainy of a third, who cherished an unrequited love for the hero. Lady Rutland goes mad, and Elizabeth remains in possession of her faculties only to be doomed to a few miserable days of loneliness and despair. All this, I think, shows the hand of an expert reviser, accustomed to making old plays please new audiences.

The Larpent manuscript of this adaptation was sent to the Examiner on December 31, 1760, only three days before the first performance at Drury Lane. This indicates that the manager was acting with unwonted haste, as he usually observed the legal requirement of two-weeks' notice fairly well. Furthermore, the manuscript is almost entirely in the handwriting of David Garrick himself, another unusual circumstance. Among the Larpent plays are over twenty others that Garrick was connected with as sole or part author, but none contains so large a proportion of his handwriting. This manuscript is, also, much corrected throughout; it contains numerous cancelled passages, often with substitutions written opposite on the back of the preceding page. It shows signs of much reworking and much indecision (a cancelled passage is occasionally restored to its original state after substitutions had been written). It is apparent that Garrick was himself preparing an acting version, but it is not possible to say whether he was working from Brooke's version of 1750 or from a revision of that made by Brooke. I suspect that he was using the old Dublin text; but he was not working alone. A few corrections are found in a hand that appears to be Brooke's.¹¹

¹¹ For opinions sustaining my guesses about the handwriting I am indebted to the staff of the Manuscripts Department of the Huntington Library.

The text of the manuscript differs a good deal from that of the edition of 1761, and among the passages cancelled in the manuscript and not printed are several that might have been construed in 1760 as having political significance. Since the manuscript shows no sign of censorship by the Examiner, one may assume that these passages were removed by Garrick, who would realize the danger of delay if revisions were demanded, and would know that Brooke was still remembered as the author of the objectionable *Gustavus Vasa*, which had been prohibited in 1739. The most remarkable of these lines are seen in the three examples that follow.

At the end of Act I, the following lines of Elizabeth are deleted.¹²

No tool for faction—I will see and hear,
Not by state organs, ear'd[?] and spectacled
To your presentments; but with face to face,
Sovereign and Subject. No, I will no more
Of state-worn manacles, and Royal bondage;
Fretting the mind, and shutting from its eye
The brighter day of truth.

In Act III, in cancelled lines, Essex refers to courts as places

Where unacquainted virtue meets a foe
In every face, and worth is sure dishonour.¹³

From Cecil's account of Essex' address to the citizens urging rebellion the following lines were removed:

If all should fail
To move you, for your country, for yourselves,
Yet for your Queen arise; She claims your rescue,
Close prisoner kept, under mock shew of Royalty,
By a cabal of traytors.

Even before Wilkes and Junius began their attacks, ministers were sensitive to such allusions to factions, tools, the ingratitude of courts, and cabals of traitors. Brooke should have known this; and Garrick certainly had no notion of espousing Brooke's liberal politics or of flying in the face of the Examiner of plays.¹⁴

The handwriting and alterations, of course, show that Garrick had a considerable part in Brooke's adaptation of Banks as it

¹² Banks's lines at this point are quite different.

¹³ Banks's Essex (1682 edition, p. 42) expresses a similar notion less explicitly and at greater length.

¹⁴ Edward Capell, Deputy Examiner, was the active official at this time.

appeared at this time. It is likely that Garrick was responsible for removing objectionable lines. Finally, the alterations in the last act, at those points where this version differs from the others, especially in the introduction of a mad heroine and the exaggeration of the pathos, are quite characteristic of the Garrick method of adaptation, as it may be seen, for instance, in his *Romeo and Juliet*. Brooke's *The Earl of Essex*, therefore, appears to be another of those adaptations in which Garrick had so large a share that he should be regarded as a collaborator.

DOUGALD MACMILLAN

The University of North Carolina

MILTON AND EDWARD ECCLESTONE'S NOAH'S FLOOD

The appearance of the Miltonic tradition in the English theatre since the time of the poet has been so thoroughly studied¹ as to render it improbable that any significant contribution to the subject will be forthcoming. There remains, however, an interesting connection between *Paradise Lost* and a little-known Restoration opera. I refer to Edward Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood, or The Destruction of the World*,² which appeared in 1679, only two years after the publication of Dryden's rhymed operatic version of Milton's epic. I shall summarize here the action and the few other known facts concerning Ecclestone's piece.

If Dryden's *The State of Innocence* was excluded from the theatre because, in Dr. Johnson's words, "it cannot be decently represented upon the stage,"³ this later opera of Ecclestone in failing to appear can claim not even the excuse of impropriety of costume. It would be difficult to find more absurd theatrical entertainment than *Noah's Flood*; here we have the scraps of the worst Restoration "operatic" practices.

¹ Cf. R. D. Havens (*The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, Cambridge, 1922) and Alwin Thaler ("Milton in the Theatre," in *Shakspeare's Silences*, Cambridge, 1929).

² I have used the copies in the Library of Congress and in the Harvard University Library, both of which are of the same edition: *Noah's Flood, or, the Destruction of the World*, dedicated to Her Grace the Dutchess of Monmouth, by Edward Ecclestone, Gent. London: Printed by M. Clark, and sold by B. Tooke at the Ship in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1679.

³ Quoted by D. E. Baker, *Biographia Dramatica* (London, 1782), II, 385.

Ecclestone discards the theme of the fall in Eden, which Dryden follows in *The State of Innocence*, and substitutes for it a warring of Lucifer and the powers of Hell upon Noah and his family. Act I opens with a scene in Hell in which Lucifer, Asmodey, Belial, and Satan discuss the coming flood on Earth and rejoice that mankind is about to perish. Lucifer determines to destroy the ark bearing Noah and the animals. He dispatches Belial to look about and to find a means of bringing ruin upon Noah. Belial returns and announces his intention of disguising himself as a beast and entering the ark, there to breed sin and discord. Lucifer and his cohorts, meanwhile, will hover about the ark outside and brew fierce storms to wreck it.

In Act II the angel Gabriel comes to Noah to warn him of the approaching flood. Noah is instructed to build and to prepare the ark into which he is to take his family and the animals. Gabriel departs, and the scene shifts to Hell, where Lucifer and his company continue their plans to plague Noah.

Sacrifices are offered to Heaven by the sons of Noah at the opening of the third act. Noah enters and is accosted by Lucifer disguised as an angel. He is told that the flood will not occur. Suddenly Gabriel appears and reveals the true character of Lucifer. Moloch (*not* Belial) is found in the shape of a beast and is warned to stay away from the ark. In an ensuing scene in Hell the devils plan open warfare upon Noah and his company. Meanwhile the flood waters begin to rise.

Act IV opens with a spectacular scene in which Lucifer and his cohorts assault the ark. The protection of Heaven remains over Noah, however, and the devils retreat to Pandemonium for a council. Here Sin and Death enter and offer to tempt Noah to destruction by the lure of the flesh. Lucifer accepts the plan, and the evil beings betake themselves to Earth. A final scene represents Noah's thanksgiving as the flood waters begin to withdraw.

In the closing act Noah and his sons become drunk with wine which they have distilled from a "poisonous berry" called the grape. In a stupor Noah dreams of the future and sees his family cursed with adversity for their sins. An angel appears from Heaven and announces that the people of Earth must scatter abroad and populate all regions and climes. As countless multitudes are dispersed to the several parts of Earth from the burning Tower of Babel, the opera closes.

The text of the piece is amply prefaced by Ecclestone's own "Epistle to the Reader" and by congratulatory rhymes from friends. In the minds of these authors there seems to have been some confusion regarding the exact nature of Ecclestone's debt to Dryden and, more specifically, to the original model of Milton. One Richard Saunders writes:

We see an active soul in every line,
And every word is like thy Theme, *Divine*
Dryden will grieve to hear thy Couplets Chime
And yield he's foy'd at his own Weapon, Rhime.

Another friend, John Leanerd, praises the work in this wise:

Milton reviv'd, or rather *Dryden* trac'd
Each step found out and follow'd, though in haste,
A second *Op'ra* to the World is brought,
Full of quick sence, smooth fancy, subtle thought.

To what extent he has revived Milton the dramatist does not tell us. He seeks only to excuse himself for his mixture of sacred and profane subjects:

As for the Nature of the Poem, which is Holy, though intermixt with Spirits, yet I have not herein trod in an unknown path, but shall procure Authority for what I do . . . *Mr. Dreydon's State of Innocency and Fall of Man*, is of the same Nature with this, from whose incomparable Piece I drew this rugged draught; and Milton's *Paradise Lost* is full of the same Adornments [spirits?].

He has forgotten that Milton furnishes, through Dryden, more than the "adornments" of his play. Actually, there is little of Dryden's work in the piece. The points of similarity between the two operas are few in number. There are the opening scenes in Hell and the expression of Lucifer's determination for revenge, the appearance of angels sent from Heaven to warn Man of approaching danger, and the disguise of Lucifer for the purpose of hastening the fall of Man. But Ecclestone's dependency upon Dryden ends here, and it would seem that he turned to the original for that with which his imagination did not supply him.

Particularly convincing are two appearances of the Sin and Death motif which indicate immediately the familiarity of the author with *Paradise Lost*. Since Dryden makes no use of these characters in *The State of Innocence*, Ecclestone must have gone to Milton for them. In Act IV of the opera, while the ark is being

besieged by Lucifer from without, a masque-like interlude takes place:

Enter Sin and Death, Sin appearing upward like a fair Beautiful Woman, but ending in a Serpentine Scaly Tail,⁴ Death wearing a Crown of Gold upon his Head.⁵

Sin and Death talk of the latter's triumph over the dead. Sin recounts the conception of Death and explains his origin through her union with Satan.⁶ The two plan that Sin shall lure Man to his downfall. Again, in Act V, a second scene takes place in which these two figures reappear. After Noah has become drunk

. . . a sumptuous Banquet of all sorts of Fruits, especially of Grapes, rises up out of the Earth. Sin enters in a rich, gaudy loose Attire, and after her several Devils in the shapes of men and women who make their obedience to her. . . . Death rises with a Dart in his hand,⁷ moving it, by turns at everyone of them. They all draw and fight and mortally wound each other.

It is obvious that Ecclestone's figures are turned to his own purposes; but they are unquestionably Miltonic in origin.

There is, however, the probability that the prefaces to the work, in particular that of the author, have deliberately minimized the nature of the dramatist's debt to Milton. A complete disregard of the great original must certainly have been unreasonable before readers who were acquainted, however slightly or indifferently, with those verses which Dryden had "tagged" in *The State of Innocence*. Yet Ecclestone exercised considerable care in directing his chief acknowledgment to that poet who enjoyed a reputation happily unclouded by any previous allegiance to the Commonwealth and who, by virtue of his popularity as a dramatist, might, in some measure, carry a new play by a little known author in the wake of his triumphs. Much less felicitous would have been an acknowledgment of indebtedness to the Latin Secretary under Cromwell; Ecclestone did not choose to emphasize it. If Dryden's opera was handicapped by its relation to Milton,⁸ upon whom the restored

⁴ Cf. *Paradise Lost*, II, 724.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 765-6.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 673.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 672.

⁸ The similarity of the opera to *Paradise Lost* may have determined its failure to attain performance inasmuch as Milton was suspect as a Puritan at the time. Cf. Alwin Thaler, "Milton in the Theatre," *SP.*, xvii (1920), 281. Several years after its appearance, in 1712, a play modeled upon the opera was produced in a London puppet show, a performance which, accord-

monarchy could look scarcely with favor, so may *Noah's Flood* have failed to gain the favor which its author sought. No one in any degree familiar with Milton's epic could have failed to notice the nature of Ecclestone's borrowings.

Noah's Flood, apart from its failure to arrive on the stage, was unsuccessful with the reading public. Twelve years after it appeared Gerard Langbaine wrote of the piece:

This play not going off, a new Title and Cuts were affix'd to it in Hillary Term, 1684, it then going under the Title of The Cataclism, or General Deluge of the World.⁹

J. R. BAIRD

New Haven, Connecticut

WORDSWORTH AND THE PATHETIC FALLACY

The parallels between Ruskin's theory of the pathetic fallacy and certain of Wordsworth's observations on poetic diction and style are sufficiently close to suggest that the essentials of Ruskin's famous essay had already been enunciated by the poet. We know that Ruskin was familiar with Wordsworth's critical essays, since three times in his works he makes a passing reference to them and since in "Fiction, Fair and Foul" he says: "I happen myself to have used Wordsworth as a daily text-book from youth to age, and have lived, moreover, in all essential points according to the tenor of his teaching."¹

The relation between Wordsworth's critical theories and Ruskin's "On the Pathetic Fallacy" may be thus summarized. (1) Both were advocates of naturalism, insisting that the best style is based on seeing clearly and describing accurately what is seen. (2) Wordsworth as well as Ruskin deprecates an untrue presentation of "real objects" due to false or misguided sentiment, and he cites some instances of what Ruskin later called the pathetic fallacy. (3) But Wordsworth avoids forming a system, and actually advocates the

ing to Professor Havens, may have been suggested by the *Spectator Papers* on Milton. Cf. R. D. Havens, "An Adaptation of One of Dryden's Plays," *RES.*, IV (1928), 88.

⁹ *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets* (Oxford, 1691), p. 186.

¹ *Works of Ruskin*, "Library Edition," IV, 229-230, 299; XII, 354; XXXIV, 349.

pathetic fallacy when it is the product of the imagination and the fancy.

(1) The foundation of Ruskin's essay is his insistence on naturalism and truth in literature as in art. This attitude is best affirmed elsewhere in *Modern Painters*: "the more I think of it I find this conclusion more impressed upon me,—that the greatest thing a human soul ever does in this world is to *see* something, and tell what it *saw* in a plain way."² We are reminded of Wordsworth's statement:

I do not know how to give my Reader a more exact notion of the style in which it was my wish and intention to write, than by informing him that I have at all times endeavoured to look steadily at my subject; consequently, there is I hope in these Poems little falsehood of description, and my ideas are expressed in language fitted to their respective importance.³

Here Wordsworth says he saw truthfully, and told what he saw "in a plain way," to use Ruskin's phrase. Again he remarks that, with certain exceptions, the poetry from Milton to Thomson "does not contain a single new image of external Nature; and scarcely presents a familiar one from which it can be inferred that the eye of the Poet had been steadily fixed upon his object."⁴ Turning to Ruskin's "Essay" we find this echo of Wordsworth's final phrase:

. . . but it is only the basest writer who cannot speak of the sea without talking of 'raging waves,' 'remorseless floods,' 'ravenous billows,' etc.; and it is one of the signs of the highest power in a writer to check all such habits of thought, and to keep his eyes fixed firmly on the *pure fact*.⁵

Thus far we may say that Ruskin is, consciously or unconsciously, repeating Wordsworth.

(2) Did Wordsworth distinguish the peculiar type of observation of things that Ruskin terms the pathetic fallacy, that is, a false perception of things due to strong feeling? This is certainly implied in the above quotations. But Wordsworth admits that passion may color the language of a poet:

The earliest poets of all nations generally wrote from passion excited by real events; they wrote naturally, and as men: feeling powerfully as they

² *Op. cit.*, v, 333.

³ Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*, 1800, *Prose Works*, ed. Grosart, II, 84.

⁴ "Essay Supplementary to the Preface," Grosart, II, 118.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, v, 211.

did, their language was daring, and figurative. In succeeding times, Poets, and Men ambitious of the fame of Poets, perceiving the influence of such language, and desirous of producing the same effect without being animated by the same passion, set themselves to a mechanical adoption of these figures of speech, and made use of them, sometimes with propriety, but much more frequently applied them to feelings and thoughts with which they had no natural connection whatsoever.⁶

Ruskin elaborates these points in describing his fourth class of poets.

A poet is great, first in proportion to the strength of his passion, and then, that strength being granted, in proportion to his government of it; there being, however, always a point beyond which it would be inhuman and monstrous if he pushed this government, and, therefore, a point at which all feverish and wild fancy becomes just and true. Thus the destruction of the kingdom of Assyria cannot be contemplated firmly by a prophet of Israel. The fact is too great, too wonderful. It overthrows him, dashes him into a confused element of dreams. All the world is, to his stunned thought, full of strange voices. 'Yea, the fir-trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, "Since thou art gone down to the grave, no feller is come up against us."' . . .

But by how much this feeling is noble when it is justified by the strength of its cause, by so much it is ignoble when there is not cause enough for it; and beyond all other ignobleness is the mere affectation of it, in hardness of heart. Simply bad writing may almost always . . . be known by its adoption of these fanciful metaphorical expressions as a sort of current coin; yet there is even a worse, . . . in which such expressions are not ignorantly and feelinglessly caught up, but, by some master, skilful in handling, yet insincere, deliberately wrought out with chill and studied fancy.⁷

Ruskin then quotes Pope in illustration, one of the school of writers whom Wordsworth was attacking!

Wordsworth himself points out as false style the very use of the pathetic fallacy that Ruskin attributes to second-class poets. Further on in his note on poetic diction, he quotes the following lines from Cowper:

But the sound of the church-going bell
These valleys and rocks never heard,
Ne'er sigh'd at the sound of a knell,
Or smiled when a Sabbath appeared.

After commenting sharply on "church-going" as applied to a bell, he says:

⁶ "Of Poetic Diction," Grosart, II, 101.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, v, 215-216.

The two lines 'Ne'er sigh'd at the sound,' &c., are, in my opinion, an instance of the language of passion wrested from its proper use, and . . . applied upon an occasion that does not justify such violent expressions.*

(3) While there is much agreement between Wordsworth's attitude and many aspects of Ruskin's "Essay," Wordsworth never formulates a theory of the pathetic fallacy. The greatest poets, says Ruskin, perceive rightly, in spite of their feelings:

Therefore the high creative poet might even be thought, to a great extent, impassive (as shallow people think Dante stern), receiving indeed all feelings to the full, but having a great centre of reflection and knowledge in which he stands serene, and watches the feeling, as it were, from afar off.°

We are reminded at once of Wordsworth's "emotions recollected in tranquillity." But Wordsworth's conception of the great poet is not determined by such an application of the niceties of the pathetic fallacy as Ruskin makes. On the contrary, Wordsworth regards a genuine use of the pathetic fallacy as one of the products of man's highest creative faculty, the imagination and its humbler sister fancy. The habit of accurate observation and description, unaffected by the passions, is but the first step. The result of this observation ultimately passes through the alembic of the imagination, and the final product should be something new, something more than a reproduction of nature.

Two quotations, which Wordsworth gives in the 1815 Preface, illustrate what he means by imagination in the forming of poetic images or pictures.

In the first Eclogue of Virgil, the shepherd, thinking of the time when he is to take leave of his farm, thus addresses his goats:—

Non ego vos posthac viridi projectus in antro
Dumosa pendere procul de rupe videbo.

. . . half way down

Hangs one who gathers samphire,

is the well-known expression of Shakspeare, delineating an ordinary image upon the cliffs of Dover. In these two instances is a slight exertion of the faculty which I denominate imagination, in the use of one word: neither the goats nor the samphire-gatherer do literally hang . . . but, presenting to the senses something of such an appearance, the mind in its activity, for its own gratification, contemplates them as hanging.¹⁰

* Grosart, II, 104.

° *Op. cit.*, v, 210.

¹⁰ Grosart, II, 136.

Finally, Wordsworth quotes two instances of the pathetic fallacy, both of which he approves as products of the creative faculty, the first being an instance of mere fancy, while the second is the product of imagination.

I will content myself with placing a conceit (ascribed to Lord Chesterfield) in contrast with a passage from the 'Paradise Lost':—

The dews of the evening most carefully shun,
They are the tears of the sky for the loss of the sun.

After the transgression of Adam, Milton, with other appearances of sympathising Nature, thus marks the immediate consequence,

Sky lowered, and muttering thunder, some sad drops
Wept at completion of the mortal sin.

The associating link is the same in each instance: Dew and rain, not distinguishable from the liquid substance of tears, are employed as indications of sorrow. A flash of surprise is the effect in the former case; a flash of surprise, and nothing more; for the nature of things does not sustain the combination. In the latter, the effects from the act, of which there is this immediate consequence and visible sign, are so momentous, that the mind acknowledges the justice and reasonableness of the sympathy in nature so manifested; and the sky weeps drops of water as if with human eyes.¹¹

Evidently Wordsworth would not deny poets of the "first rank" the use of the pathetic fallacy. On the contrary, he regards this species of figurative language as the product of the creative mind, if the feeling which engendered it is true, and if its ultimate origin is an accurate observation of "things as they are in themselves."

On the whole it would appear that Wordsworth anticipated the best things of Ruskin's famous essay.

JAMES V. LOGAN

The Ohio State University

A NOTE ON CHARLES HOPKINS (c. 1671-1700)

Among the lesser figures in the age of Dryden, Charles Hopkins, friend of both Dryden and Congreve, has been somewhat neglected. His reputation for amiability and good fellowship, well supported by the testimony of his more famous friends, and the merit of his best poems, a number of light love lyrics, give him a just claim to

¹¹ Grosart, II, 142.

notice. So pleasing is the impression of gaiety and charm derived from even a casual reading of his best verses, that we would gladly know more of this persuasive Irishman—Irish by early training and education at least, and possibly by birth. On a few points the present note seeks to shed some light.

On the date and place of his birth the *DNB.* seems to have adopted the less likely alternative. Charles was the son of Bishop Ezekiel Hopkins by his first wife: so much is clear; but when he was born, and where, remain uncertain. The *DNB.* gives the birth date as "1664?" and the city as Exeter. Writers who support this view, with more or less authority, are Giles Jacob,¹ Alexander Chalmers,² Thomas Fuller's successor,³ and William B. S. Taylor.⁴ Unfortunately, John Prince,⁵ who is supposed to have known Charles's father and who, therefore, might have told us with certainty, mentions the poet only in passing.

On the other hand, we have two educational records which indicate that Charles was born in 1671 at Dublin. These are records of matriculation at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1685, *aged 14*,⁶ and at Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1687.⁷ The latter record repeats the information given in the former about the boy's age, and was probably copied from it. Now, the Trinity College record appears to carry more weight than the undocumented essays of early biographers; and, indeed, a youth was more likely to enter the university at the age of 14 than 21. Moreover, the later date agrees better with what we know of his father's movements, which are fairly clear.

Although Ezekiel Hopkins was apparently married to his first wife some time in the early 'sixties, he did not leave London for Exeter until 1666.⁸ It is difficult to see how the poet could have

¹ *Poetical Register*, London, 1723, I, 75.

² *The General Biographical Dictionary*, new edition, London, 1814, XVIII, 157.

³ *History of the Worthies of England*, ed. P. A. Nuttall, London, 1840, I, 449.

⁴ *History of the University of Dublin*, London, 1845, p. 411.

⁵ *Danmonii Orientales; or, the Worthies of Devon*, Exeter, 1701.

⁶ G. D. Burtchaell and T. U. Sadleir, *Alumni Dublinenses 1593-1860*, new ed., Dublin, 1935, p. 410.

⁷ John A. and John Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses from the earliest times to 1900*, Cambridge, 1922-27, pt. I, vol. II, 405.

⁸ Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis: 1500-1714*, vols. I and II, Early Series, Oxford, 1891, p. 743.

been born in either Exeter or Dublin in 1664. In 1671, on the other hand, Charles's father had just been made Bishop of Raphoe,⁹ county Donegal, Ireland. Charles Hopkins could, therefore, have been born in Ireland, even in Dublin, as has been suggested. If we accept the later date, Exeter might still have been his birthplace, since Prince notes that Ezekiel made an extended visit to Exeter some time while he was Bishop of Raphoe—namely, between 1671 and 1681, although it is unlikely that he would have absented himself from his new charge immediately. On the whole it seems best to trust the matriculation records, and put his birth tentatively at Dublin in 1671.

The identity of the poet's mother is also somewhat obscure. There is a record of the Bishop's second marriage, but not of his first. The first Mrs. Hopkins was, says the *DNB*. (following Prince) a niece of Sir Robert Vyner (or Vyner), sometime Mayor of London. However, the rather full history of the Vyner family¹⁰ shows that Sir Robert's nieces all made other marriages, or can be otherwise accounted for. There is another possibility. Sir Thomas Vyner, goldsmith (1588-1665), and, incidentally, uncle of Sir Robert, left Ezekiel Hopkins ten pounds in his will, dated March 16, 1664. This Sir Thomas had several nieces, and in some cases marriages for them are not recorded. Possibly Prince confused the two, and Ezekiel married one of Sir Thomas's nieces.¹¹

A third question involves the poet's religion. The *DNB*. in its account of Ezekiel Hopkins states that the Protestant bishop was much grieved by the apostasy of Charles, who aided the Roman Catholics in the Irish uprising of 1688. Apparently the editors have taken this view from Prince, who says that the Bishop did not live long after his flight from Ireland, being "much broken by the publick as well as his own private calamities, (that being none of the least of them, that his son had entered himself of the Roman Catholick army in Ireland)."¹² It should be noted that Prince

⁹ Henry Cotton, *Fasti ecclesiae hibernicae*, Dublin, 1848-60, II, 171-2.

¹⁰ Charles and Henry Vyner, *Vyner: A Family History*, 1885.

¹¹ Sir Thomas Vyner had ten brothers and sisters, seven of them by his father's previous marriage. Of Sir Thomas's many nieces, the most likely wife for Ezekiel Hopkins—if she was not too old—seems to be either Alice or Sara Moore. Both were daughters of Mary Vyner (b. 1575) and Samuel Moore, a goldsmith of London. No marriage is recorded for either of them.

¹² *Loc. cit.*, 517.

does not say "his son *Charles*"—it may have been one of the other shadowy children of the shadowy first wife. Moreover, Nichols, in whose *Miscellany* many of Charles Hopkins's poems are printed, says that he "exerted his early valour in the cause of his country, religion, and liberty,"¹³ i. e., presumably in the cause of the Protestant succession. It seems more likely that Nichols is right, judging by the fact that Charles later came to England under William and settled there apparently quite happily. Furthermore, his *Whitehall; or the Court of England* (also known as *The Court Prospect*) praises extravagantly William of Orange as "Restorer of the Christian World" and flatters all his court.

Finally, the *DNB.* is also uncertain about the date of Charles Hopkins's death. This can now be fixed. The poet's dedication of his play *Friendship Improv'd*, dated from Londonderry, November 1, 1699, refers to his failing health, and the parish register of Derry Cathedral¹⁴ reveals that he died in the parish of Templemore, Londonderry, and was buried on March 7, 1700. His will was probated in that year,¹⁵ but was lost in the destruction at the Four Courts, Dublin, in 1922.¹⁶

ALICE E. JONES

Philadelphia

THE DATING OF YOUNG'S *NIGHT-THOUGHTS*

It has been customary to accept the year 1745 as the terminal date of the serial publication of Young's *Night-Thoughts*, the first part of which was published in the summer of 1742.¹ The source

¹³ J. Nichols, *A Select Collection of Poems*, London, 1780, II, 183.

¹⁴ *Register of Derry Cathedral, S. Columb's, Parish of Templemore, Londonderry, 1642-1703*, Parish Register Society, Dublin, VIII (1910), 354.

¹⁵ W. P. W. Phillimore et al., *Indexes to Irish Wills*, Irish Record Series, London, 1920; vol. 5 (*Derry and Raphoe*) edited by Gertrude Thrift.

¹⁶ Memorandum from the Deputy Keeper, January 22, 1938.

¹ Entries in the Stationers' Register of the first eight parts have been published in W. Thomas's *Le poète Edward Young* (Paris, 1901, pp. 349-352); further evidence of dating of "Nights" I-VI and VIII has been presented in two notes in *RES* for 1928 (R. W. C[hapman], "Young's 'Night Thoughts,'" IV, 330 and George Sherburn, "Edward Young and Book Advertising," IV, 414-417). Summary of this evidence appears in the abstract of my unpublished dissertation (*Cornell University Abstracts of Theses*, Ithaca, N. Y., 1939, p. 43).

of the date 1745 is the quarto first edition of "The Consolation," the ninth and last of the *Night-Thoughts*. Here the date "1745" appears in the publisher's imprint at the foot of the title-page, and the date "October 1745" at the end of the appended: "Thoughts occasioned by the Present Juncture." Heretofore unnoticed, however, is the combined evidence of periodical advertising and of the Stationers' Register alike, both sources pointing to the earliest appearance of "The Consolation" during the last week of January 1746. It is first listed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* among books published in January 1746 as well as in the following newspapers for 1746: *True Patriot*, 28 January; *General Evening Post*, 30 January; *Old England*, 1 February; *London Evening Post*, 8 February. Through the generous courtesy of the present clerk of Stationers' Hall, the entry in the Stationers' Register has been located under date of 21 January 1745 [New Style 1746], when "The Consolation . . . To which are annexed some thoughts occasioned by the Present Juncture. . . ." was registered for the publisher George Hawkins and the usual nine copies deposited.

Beloit College

HENRY PETTIT

REVISION IN BROWNING'S *PARACELSUS*

Browning's *Paracelsus*, as we have it, is not altogether the work of a youthful poet. It was revised four times; and of the 4151 lines in the 1888 version, published the year before his death, only 1477 lines are identical with those in the first edition of 1835. The revisions can be grouped under three general headings: mechanical changes (punctuation, capitalization, spelling, etc.); expansion or condensation of thought; and stylistic changes.

The mechanical revisions have usually been regarded as "minor" and unimportant, but one occasionally meets a significant alteration such as in lines 178-180 in Scene III:¹

1835: So make me smile, if the exulting look
You wore but now be smiling. 'Tis so long
Since I have smiled!

1888: So, make me smile! If the exulting look
You wore but now be smiling, 'tis so long
Since I have smiled!

¹ The line numbers throughout are those of the 1888 edition.

The condensed passages (altogether ninety-four lines were omitted at one time or another) do not materially change the thought development, but merely express the original thought in fewer words. The expanded passages (149 lines were added) in general add color, but specifically strengthen the arguments of Festus and show an increased interest in the characterization of Aprile. Twelve separate passages have been added which expand the characterization of this "strange competitor" of Paracelsus. Sometimes they are brief allusions in a speech of Paracelsus, such as:

IV, 225: Aprile was a poet, I make songs—

V, 854: I saw Aprile—my Aprile there!

But there are also longer passages, like the eleven lines added after line 407 in Scene II:

They spread contagion, doubtless: yet he seemed
To echo one foreboding of my heart
So truly, that . . . no matter! How he stands
With eve's last sunbeam staying on his hair
Which turns to it as if they were akin:
And those clear smiling eyes of saddest blue
Nearly set free, so far they rise above
The painful fruitless striving of the brow
And enforced knowledge of the lips, firm-set
In slow despondency's eternal sigh!
Has he, too, missed life's end, and learned the cause?

The great bulk of revisions in the poem are stylistic, changes in phraseology and word order. The number of feminine endings is reduced, rhythms are made smoother, internal rime is discarded, graphic words are added, obscure passages are here and there clarified. The revised *Paracelsus* is certainly a more graceful composition than the original, although the refinement of style necessarily results in a loss of rugged strength. Sometimes dramatic intensity is sacrificed for balance as in Scene I, which in the original version ended with the lines:

Para. Are there not Festus, are there not dear Michal
Two points in the adventure of the diver:
One—when a beggar he prepares to plunge?
One—when a prince he rises with his pearl?
Festus, I plunge.

The 1849 edition adds:

Fest. We wait you when you rise.

Chiefly, however, the 1849 revisions make for an uncharacteristic smoothness of style or the elimination of feminine lines, as a few examples chosen at random will illustrate:

- I, 188: 1835: Is in a life as though no God there were
1849: In living just as though there were no God
- II, 103: 1835: If he be priest henceforth, if he wake up
1849: If he be priest henceforth, or if he wake
- II, 156: 1835: To its existence: life, death, light, and shadow
1849: To its existence: life, death, light and shade
- III, 313: 1835: For the manner—'tis ungracious, probably
1849: The manner is ungracious, probably
- V, 418: 1835: Thus the Mayne glideth
1849: Softly the Mayne river glideth
- V, 479: 1835: The gulf rolls like a meadow-swell, o'erstrewn
1849: The gulf rolls like a meadow, overstrewn
- V, 529: 1835: He looked for confirmation and approval
1849: He looked for confirmation and applause

If the influence of Elizabeth Barrett Browning is responsible for any of these stylistic changes in the 1849 revision—as seems quite possible²—there may be a double significance in the reverting of 442 lines, including all but one of those quoted above,³ to their original form in the three subsequent revisions, the first of which appeared in 1863, two years after the death of Browning's critic-wife.

The Ohio State University

BERNICE FOX

A NOTE ON R. L. S.

Autobiographical material from Stevenson's *Geometry Notebook* has appeared in print only twice up to the present time,¹ and on neither occasion has any reference been made to the most significant

² The revisions in this poem are nowhere mentioned by her, but we do know that she was suggesting revisions for other poems at this time; and the analogous nature of those revisions we know from Sir Frederick Kenyon's list of them published in his *New Poems by Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett Browning* (London, 1914), and from the article by E. Snyder and F. Palmer, Jr., "New Light on the Brownings," *Quarterly Review*, July, 1937.

³ The last half of I, 188, reverted; but Festus' comment at the end of Scene I was allowed to remain.

¹ Christopher Morley, *Saturday Review of Literature*, March 19, 1927; Edward D. Snyder, *ibid.*, August 3, 1935.

verses in this informal but revealing volume, which is now in the possession of Haverford College. Of the important material hitherto unpublished, one early poem, printed below, seems of special significance for its mood of deep pessimism. Had these verses appeared but once in the *Notebook*, they might be dismissed as the artificial and insignificant gesture of a youth momentarily given to sophomoric cynicism; but since the eight most crucial lines appear three times, and in different parts of the *Notebook*,² and since several of the other lines appear twice, the poem claims our attention as presumably voicing the actual, recurring mood of the youthful Stevenson during those dark Edinburgh years of which his biographers have written so sparingly.

In these verses from the *Geometry Notebook*, now printed for the first time, R. L. S. seems to have given up hope of any satisfactory intercourse with his fellows; he recognizes the value of sociability and portrays it in mellow terms; yet he seems to regard himself as a being outside the pale, as a wanderer on the face of the earth, perhaps a complete outcast. While he is outside, "in the rain and mire," he sees the cheerful fire "glint behind the curtain." But he does not have any hope of sharing in the "pleasant household laughter." Here are his poignant verses:—

On this dreary shore
Where hearts are broken daily,
I shall sing no more
Pleasantly and gaily.

All my hopes are broken—
All my glad words spoken—
I shall sing no more
Pleasantly and gaily.

Warmly by the hearth
At e'en to rest is pleasant,
Quiet household mirth
Pleases Lord and peasant.

All these joys are over
.....
.....
.....

Often I may hear
The pleasant household laughter
Shake with goodly cheer
Homely board and rafter,

In the rain and mire
Belated and uncertain,
Often see the fire
Glint behind the curtain.

[Alternative Ending.]

Warmly by the hearth
To rest at e'en is pleasant,
Quiet household mirth
Pleases Lord and peasant—

Only that—and then
I go hence and know
that [Desunt cetera.]

Haverford College

EDWARD D. SNYDER

² The first eight lines are found on pp. 8, 9, 27.

THE DATES OF SOME OF ROBERT BRIDGES' LYRICS

At my request Mrs. Robert Bridges very kindly looked through her husband's papers for material which might aid in the dating of his lyric poems. She found a loose-leaf notebook containing fifty-eight poems in manuscript, and allowed me to transcribe the dates affixed to them by their author. The years in which twelve of these poems were written may be found in the Oxford Standard Authors edition of Bridges' Poems (1936); the dates of the other forty-six are given below.

<i>First words</i>	<i>MS. date</i>	<i>First words</i>	<i>MS. date</i>
All-ador'd	1910	No country know I	1917
As our car	1921; corrected 1925	O Love, I complain	1896
At dead of unseen	1902	On a mournful day	1916
Beneath the wattled	1895	One grief of thine	1900
Crown Winter	1889	Over the warring	1916
Folk alien	1914; dated 1904 in printed text	Power eternal	Finished May 16, 1898
From a friend's	1921	Riding adown	1899
How should I be	1921	See, Love, a year	1902
How well my eyes	1899	Since I believe	1912
I climb the mossy	Dec., 1895	Sweet pretty	Feb., 1913
I have lain	1911 or 1912	The day begins	Jan., 1894
I have sown	1899	The saddest place	1899
In still midsummer	1910; one word corrected, 1919	The sea keeps not	1899
It's all up	1902; corrected 1920	These grey stones	1902-3
Joy, sweetest lifeborn	1879	To my love	1895
Look down the river	1897	'Twas mid of the moon	1921
Love on my heart	Feb., 1890	Two demons thrust	1913
Lo where the virgin	1904	Voyaging northwards	1899
Man hath with man	1899	What happy bonds	1902
Mazing around	April, 1913	What voice	Jan., 1892
Mortal though I	"1905 or earlier"	When to my lone	1902
My delight and thy	Aug. and Nov., 1896	Who goes there?	Feb., 1913
		Why hast thou nothing	1899
		Would that you were	1902; corrected 1920

Mrs. Bridges also allowed me to transcribe from her husband's copy of the 1873 *Poems* the dates which he had entered in pencil. This is Robert Bridges' earliest volume, and only seventeen of its fifty-three poems were reprinted in later volumes. Bridges' memory,

like that of so many poets, was not infallible. N. C. Smith writes: "Of his first volume, published in 1873, he himself wrote that he 'went to the seaside (Seaford) for two weeks and wrote it there.'" ¹ The book itself contains an "Advertisement" saying: "The foregoing poems, with the exception of a few that have their proper dates affixed, were written between the summers of seventy-two and seventy-three." ² The dates of only four of the poems (here enclosed by parentheses) were printed in the 1873 *Poems*.

A boy and a girl#	Sept., 1872	Love is up#	1862; corrected 1873
A lady sat high#	Aug., 1872	Love, that is king#	1873
All women born	Aug., 1873	Night by night#	Seaford, 1873
An Abbot once lived#	Sept., 1872, Seaford	Oh how have I of- fended?#	March, 1873
An idle June#	July, 1873	Old Thunder is dead#	(1869)
A poor old#	Sept., 1872	O trust the eyes#	Aug., 1872
A poppy grows	June, 1872	Parted so long#	Feb., 1873
As in our arbour#	1872	Poor withered rose	July, 1872
Assemble, all ye	Aug., 1873	Shame on his name#	Sept., 1872
Clear and gentle	Aug., 1873	She is coming#	Not dated
Come gentle Death#	1873	Sick of my#	1865; rewritten 1873
Dear Lady, when thou	Feb., 1873	Since thou dost bid#	July, 1872
Deep in the inner#	Feb., 1873	Sometimes when	Aug., 1872
For too much love#	July, 1873	The cliff-top	June, 1872
Happy the man#	(1868)	The humble bee#	1872
Her eye saw#	July, 1872	The King of a#	1873
His poisoned shafts	July, 1873	The merry elves#	1873
I found to-day	June, 1872	The wood is bare	1872
I heard a linnet	(1869)	'Twas midnight#	June, 1872
I made another song	1873	Two beds there were#	1872; Parts II, III in 1873
In my most serious#	July, 1873; lines 5-10, 1868	When first we met	Aug., 1873
In ten years hence#	Jan., 1873	When I sit to write#	(1869)
Into thy young heart#	July, 1873	When King Darius#	1873
In wooing and in#	Aug., 1873	Who has not walked	Sept., 1872
I sat one winter's#	1873	Woe to the friend#	July, 1873
I shall not see#	July, 1873		
I will not let thee go	July, 1872		
Long are the hours	Aug., 1872		

Not reprinted in later volumes.

ALBERT GUÉRARD, JR.

Harvard University

¹ "Robert Bridges," *DNB*, 1922-1930, pp. 116-7.

² Bridges, R., *Poems* (London, 1873), p. 126.

ARNOLD, SHELLEY, AND JOUBERT

Matthew Arnold's familiar quotation at the conclusion of his "Shelley" appears also in his "Byron" essay where it was first printed. The "beautiful and ineffectual angel" reference seems to have been suggested by a passage in Joubert which Arnold translates (in his essay on "Joubert") thus: "Plato loses himself in the void . . . but one sees the play of his wings, one hears their rustle."

WILLIAM S. KNICKERBOCKER

University of the South

 URFAUST L. 309 ¹

When Mephistopheles has finished advising the student of the *Urfaust* about rooms, he immediately takes up the problem of board:

Euer Logie wär nun bestellt. 306
Nun euren Tisch für leidlich Geld!

Two lines of the student follow immediately:

Mich dünkt, das gäb sich alle nach,
Wer erst von Geisteserweiterung sprach!

They are disregarded by Mephistopheles, however, who sticks to the text he has chosen, and, unfortunately, they seem to have received little attention from editors and commentators.

The student's words have always been printed as above, both in those editions which, like the original of Erich Schmidt, follow the Göchhausen manuscript as closely as possible,² and in those which emend or modify the text in order to make it uniform within itself or with manuscripts in Goethe's own hand.³ Similarly, there have

¹ The lines are numbered as printed (unnumbered) in the *Weltgoethe* edition, Bd. 12, ed. Max Hecker (1937 = 2nd redaction).

² E. Schmidt, *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt* (1894³): *dünkt*, *Geists Erweiterung*; M. Morris, *Der junge Goethe* 5: 372: *dünckt*, *Geists Erweiterung*; neither has a comma before *das gäb*. Only the orthography (modernized) of *Geisteserweiterung* has been changed in the lines quoted above.

³ E. g. *Weltgoethe* (v. note 1).

been no editions in modern German orthography which print these lines in any other way,⁴ nor have scholars in quoting them made any changes, even when consistently modernizing their quotations from Goethe.⁵

Certainly it cannot be claimed, however, that the meaning of the two lines as printed above is apparent upon a first reading, although it is clear from the context that the student would like to dissociate the problem of his physical wants from that of his intellectual development, which he considers more important. Be this as it may, the construction, when discussed at all, has been explained as an ellipsis. An American edition has the note:

gäb' sich alle nach, Wer . . . , usw.: "käme alles nach und nach von selbst für den, der . . . ," usw.⁶

and a Danish:

Wer = demjenigen, der: "det vilde altsammen bagefter give sig for den, som først talte om Aandsudvikling."⁷

Neither explanation accounts for the form *sprach*, which would have to be explained away as a sort of potential subjunctive ("for him who should speak"), since no one has actually spoken of *Geistserweiterung*. Moreover, Goethe would be charged with the omission of the umlaut for the sake of a rhyme with *nach*, or it might be claimed that the indicative form has been substituted for the regular subjunctive by analogy with the substitution common in certain conditional sentences. The explanation of *wer* is plausible because it is simple, but when closer examination reveals so many and such unusual corollaries, its simplicity and, accordingly, its plausibility cease to exist.

All difficulties are removed, however, if l. 309 is read: *Wär' erst von Geistserweiterung Sprach'*. This reading accords with Goethe's usage and with the orthographic peculiarities of the Göchhausen

⁴ E. g. The Danish and American school editions mentioned in notes 6 and 7, below.

⁵ E. g. E. Kühnemann, *Goethe* (Lzg. 1930) 1: 125; C. Sarauw, *Goethes Augen* (K. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab: hist.-filol. Meddelelser. II, 3. 1919), p. 137, cites only l. 309.

⁶ Goethe's "*Urfaust*" Edited by Lenz & Nock (New York, London, Harper & Brothers, 1938), p. 19.

⁷ *Urfaust. Goethes Faust i dens ældste skikkelse*. Carl V. Oestergaard (København 1918), p. 125.

manuscript. Fräulein von Göchhausen frequently substituted *e* for *ä*, especially when the latter recurred in successive lines. For example, in the song *Es war ein Ratt im Kellernest*, she wrote:

Bald hätt das arme Tier genug,
Als hett es Lieb im Leibe.⁹

Moreover, she sometimes used a small *s* instead of the capital, as in l. 50 of the manuscript,⁹ so that both changes can be considered as corrections of natural slips of the pen. As for the expression *von etwas Sprache sein* in the sense of *davon Rede sein*, which has been noted as used both in Leipzig and the Rheinland,¹⁰ it is found in the *Theatralische Sendung* (*Erstes Buch, Neuntes Kapitel=Lehrjahre, Siebentes Kapitel*):

Weil . . . der Gottfried, von dem die Sprache war, nicht herauskommen wollte, so musste ich . . . wieder abziehen . . .

Thus the two lines form a complete sentence, a condition with both its clauses, with no ellipses whatsoever.

The English translations of the student's two lines have not been very satisfactory. McLintock reproduces the German with:

I think the terms should that include
For one who comes for mental food.¹¹

Van der Smissen comes very close with:

That ought to come of its own accord.
Would you but speak of spiritual food!¹²

It can be objected to the latter translation, however, that there was no reason to disregard the punctuation of the Göchhausen manuscript, which errs rather in its omissions than in its insertions, especially since the result implied that in the German original there are two incomplete conditions contrary to fact in present time.

⁹ E. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁹ M. Morris, *op. cit.* 6: 531: "staubbedeckt ist in der Hs. undeutlich korrigiert: st aus St oder umgekehrt."

¹⁰ Cf. K. Albrecht, *Die Leipziger Mundart* (Lzg. 1881), p. 214: "Sprache f. Rede, Gespräch:—es ist die Sprache davon, dass eine neue Bahn gebaut werden soll; es war eben die Sprache davon; davon is gar geene Sprache = das behauptet Niemand; Rh. [i. e. Rheinland]."

¹¹ R. McLintock, *Goethe's 'Faust'* (London, 1897), p. 90.

¹² W. H. Van der Smissen, *Goethe's Faust* (London & Toronto 1928), p. 397.

Since there are striking verbal parallelisms between lines in the *Faust* known to have been written many years apart, it would hardly be wise to argue from the use of *Sprache sein* in both the *Urfaust* and the *Sendung* that the student scene was written toward the end of 1776 or the beginning of 1777, the apparent time of the inception of the *Sendung*, or that both works were conceived and begun in Leipzig at about the same time.¹³

Dartmouth College

STUART ATKINS

FOUR TEXT-NOTES ON *DEOR*

I

Lines 3 f. deal with the misery of the tormented Weland,

hæfde him to gesiþþe sorge ond longað,
wintercealde wræce.

The sentence contains two figures no doubt used by the poet with a conscious artistry. With one, the epithet *winterceald* 'bitter, severe' (cp. espec. *Wanderer* 24), I have already dealt elsewhere.¹ The other, personification of cares, is of course found universally. But for the idea of sorrow's companionship there is a close parallel already noted by Fr. Klaeber² in *Wanderer* 29 f.:

Wat se þe cunnað
hu slípen bið sorg to geferan.

Cp. also *Salomon & Sat.* 346 f.:

forhwan beoð ða gesiðas somod ætgædre,
wop ond hleahtor?

and in later times *Pearl* 371: *Of care & me 3e made accorde*, and Shakespeare's *Pericles*, I, 2. 2: *The sad companion, dull-eyed melancholy*.

The interesting MS form *gesipþe* for *gesipe*, dat. sg., is usually

¹³ The *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, under *Sprache* (col. 2722), gives no other instance of the usage in literary German than that in the *Lehrjahre*. P. Fischer, *Goethe-Wortschatz*, p. 587, also gives only the reference to the *Lehrjahre* and comments "ungewöhnlich."

¹ *PQ.*, xvii (1938), 365 ff.

² *Anglia Beibl.*, xxxii (1921), 40, n. 1.

considered to illustrate a late doubling, "which doubtless arose in the nom. acc. sg. and was then leveled into the inflected forms."³ For this there would be parallel examples in other late West-Saxon verse texts. But a simpler explanation is possible for the double consonant: in the MS (*Exeter Book*, fol. 100a) the words are spaced *toge sipp̃e*, and there may conceivably have been scribal confusion here with the word *sippan* in line 5.

The form *gesip̃e* has however been explained as a regular dat. sg. form of *gesip̃*, neut. 'companionship.'⁴ In view of the *Wanderer* parallel, this explanation is doubtful, and unnecessary when we see the use of *to* with a concrete word in the dat. sg. to be thoroughly idiomatic even where the explanatory reference concerns more than one; e.g. *Exeter Gnomes* (C) 147: *to geferan*;⁵ and analogous phrases like *Maldon* 46: *to gafole* and *Be Domes Dæge* 190: *to sorge*.⁶

II

Lines 11b f. come in the second section of *Deor*, which gives the only direct allusion in Old English literature to the sad affair of Beadohild, griefstricken at her pregnancy:

æfre ne meahte
þriste geþencan hu ymb þæt sceolde.

Line 12b is a bold elliptic construction which through successive commentaries on the poem has remained ambiguous. Usually it is taken as impersonal, and the infinitive to be supplied after *sceolde* is given as *weorðan* 'to happen, turn out.'⁷ If this impersonal construction be accepted, it would still be impossible to agree with the view of A. J. Wyatt, who rendered this half-line: 'how that should be so,' taking the allusion to be to Beadohild's wonder how she came to be with child.⁸ This view is impaired by the use

³ Kemp Malone, *Deor* (1933), pp. 18 f.

⁴ E. Ekwall, *MLR.*, xxix (1934), 81; cf. also T. Grienberger, *Anglia*, XLV (1921), 400.

⁵ Wrongly glossed as dat. pl. in B. C. Williams's ed., *Gnomic Poetry in Ags.*, 1914, pp. 141, 159.

⁶ Changed to the equivalent adverb *sorhlice* in the adapted prose version of the poem, discovered by Napier and printed in Grein-Wülker, II, 257 ff.

⁷ F. Holthausen, *Beowulf*, etc., II, 5th ed. (1929), 196; Malone, ed., p. 24. Cf. Grienberger, *loc. cit.*, p. 399.

⁸ *Ags. Reader* (1919), p. 261. In the Eddie poem, Bōðvildr was first offered drugged wine by the smith, then ravished when unconscious.

of *æfre* 11 'ever' and *þriste* 12 'resolutely, confidently,' which serve to show that the true reference is future. The correct rendering of 12b as impersonal would thus be rather: '(never might she, Beadohild, think resolutely) how it would turn out,' that is, what would be the end of her affair.

Whichever way we take it, the impersonal usage would be hard to parallel and involves a change of subject which may cause us to hesitate in agreeing with it. It seems to me more likely the phrase is not impersonal at all, that for *sceolde* just as for *meahte* 11b, the subject is 'she,' Beadohild. A prose construction with identical or very similar ellipsis deserves to be noted here as shedding valuable light on the *Deor* phrase. Two instances of it are found in the *OE Chron.*, 870 F (ed. Plummer, I, 284): *se arcebiscop na þar embe beon* [*mihte*, suppl. Plummer], and 1009 E: *þa cydde man into þære scipfyrde þæt he mann eaðe befaran mihte, gif man ymbe beon wolde* (C: *gif man embe wære*). In the collection of sermons ascribed to Wulfstan (ed. Napier, 1883) similar phrases come frequently: p. 38, line 5 f., *he* (i. e. the devil) *byð æfre ymb þæt an . . .*, similarly 191. 10, 301. 7; p. 129, line 10 f.: *uton don, swa us þearf is, beon ymbe þa bote . . .*, similarly 268. 30; cf. also 136. 11 ff., 271. 30 ff., etc.

In all these examples there can be no doubt the elliptic construction *ymbe wesan* or *beon*, is the OE equivalent of the modern idiom 'to be about (something),' e. g., *Luke* 2. 49 (AV.), or more usually 'to go about, deal with, see to,' etc., and that it is not impersonal. It seems a safe conclusion that we have this same idiom here in *Deor*, that Beadohild is again subject of the clause 12b: 'how she must go about it,' that is, deal with her sad situation. Then either *beon* or *wesan* is the verb understood.

III

At line 25a: *wean on wenan*, Klaeber was undoubtedly right in taking *wenan* as dat. pl. with sg. meaning, 'in expectation of sorrow.'⁹ He compared *Beowulf* 2895, *Andreas* 1087, *Genesis* 1985 (*wenan*), *Exodus* 165 (*wenan*), 176, 213; where not noted the form found is *wenum*. There are some other verse instances proving the rightness of this construction and showing beyond doubt (a) that *on wenan* with gen. is a formula-phrase equivalent to a

⁹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 39.

pres. participle 'hoping for, expecting,' and (b) that *wenan* wherever it occurs in this phrase must be a late form of the regular dat. pl. *wenum*; viz. *Genesis* 1027, 2701; *Be Domes Dæge* 174; *Husband's Message* 28; *Elene* 584.¹⁰ Closely parallel would be the phrase *morðres on luste* in *Andreas* 1140.

IV

36 þæt ic hwile wæs Heodeninga scop,
dryhtne dyre.

It is instructive to realize the full force intended in this pseudo-personal declaration of the poet. The term *hwile* is not merely, as sometimes translated or glossed, 'for a while, for a time,' but means 'for a very long time'—as the poet goes on to reveal (in line 38). Also, *dryhtne dyre* is not just 'dear to my lord.' Other instances show the expression is again a formula, practically equivalent to 'especially dear to my lord' or 'my lord's favorite.' Elsewhere in verse it is used particularly of those who come under special divine favor; such as Satan before his fall (*Genesis* (B) 261) or Christ enthroned in heaven (Christ 1650 f.). To the 'tribe of Seth' (*Genesis* 1247) and the apostles Simon and Judas (*Menologium* 191 f.), the exact phrase *Drihtne dyre* is applied; while at *Elene* 290 ff., St. Helena exhorting the Jews reminds them they were the race elect, *Dryhtne dyre*. Here in *Deor* also the value 'specially favored' would give an added touch of poignancy to the passage.

University of London

L. WHITBREAD

ARCITE'S MAYING

By aventure his wey he gan to holde,
To maken hym a gerland of the greves
Were it of wodebynde or hawethorn leues,
And loude he song ayeyn the sonne shene:
"May, with alle thy floures and thy grene,
Welcome be thou, faire, fresshe May,
In hope that I som grene gete may."
And from his courser, with a lusty herte,
Into the grove ful hastily he sterte.

Knight's Tale 1506-14, *Chaucer's Complete Works*,
ed. F. N. Robinson, Boston, 1933.

¹⁰ Wrongly glossed in A. S. Cook's ed. (1919) as dat. sg. of *wena*.

In the OF. *Heures de Turin*, part of a book of hours made for Chaucer's contemporary, the princely bibliophile, Jean, Duc de Berry, there is an illustration well worth attention. Folios 1-12 of the *Heures de Turin*¹ comprise a Calendar of Months, each folio being beautifully illustrated on its lower margin with a scene typical of the season. The illustration for May is entitled by the editor "promenade à cheval au mois de mai." In it a company of aristocratic people have ridden out apparently to enjoy the fresh air, the song of the birds, the blossoms, and the vivid green of the young foliage. One lady, it is true, shows us that her tastes are more practical than aesthetic, for she carries a hawk on wrist, and is attended by a young boy on foot—for the service of the hawk. But the actions of two of the riders are of particular interest. One of them, a young man, has reined in his horse below a tree. With his sword in his right hand he is slicing off young branches from its lower limbs. Another youth is snapping off branches by hand, as he leans from his saddle towards the tree. Why both seem intent upon acquiring green branches or blossoms we know not. Are they culled for a garland or for the decoration of the house?

My surmise is that there is nothing particularly strange or untoward in the actions of the young men of the picture, and, *per consequens*, with those of Arcite in the poem. The fact that the illustration is one made for a Calendar of Months indicates that the actors of May are doing a usual thing, one that anyone, gentle or simple, might be expected to do, as the fancy struck him, in the month of May. Whether Arcite's intention to collect greenery was because of his membership in the "Company of the Flower" or that "of the Leaf" we do not know.² We do know that no one who saw

¹ The illustrations of the Ms. (Biblioteca Nazionale K. iv, 29) have been reproduced in P. Durrieu, *Les Heures de Turin*, Paris, 1902.

² Professor J. M. Manly (*Canterbury Tales*, New York, 1928, note on line 1512) suggests that line 1512 was written "probably with reference to the controversy of 'the flower and the leaf.'" Any opinion of Professor Manly on Chaucer deserves attention, yet the representation in a Calendar of Months of young gentlemen plucking leaves or blossoms in May, tells against his suggestion.

Furthermore the fact that other months show labours appropriate to themselves (February, faggot-cutting; August, wheat-cutting) indicates that the artist had no idea of making his Calendar a record of occupations or pursuits that belonged specifically to the nobility and upper classes. Manly's suggestion might have greater likelihood of being true, had the artist done so.

him lopping or plucking off branches or stalks would have supposed him to have been doing anything very unusual, or suspected that by that action he was proclaiming his allegiance to the Flower or to the Leaf. Since May 1-3 appear to have been the regular days of the May-time festival,³ Robert Herrick's *Corinna's going a-Maying* perhaps best explains his aspirations and intentions.

Princeton University

HENRY SAVAGE

"AS BY THE WHELP CHASTISED IS THE LEON"

In Chaucer's *Squire's Tale* (F. 490-91) the falcon decides to tell her personal history to Canacee in order

to maken othere be war by me,
As by the whelp chastised is the leon.

Skeat's note on this passage quotes *Othello*, George Herbert, and Cotgrave for the proverb, and other commentators have traced the saying back to various proverbial forms and to Jacobus de Voragine, Vincent of Beauvais, Bartholomeus Anglicus, and even St. Ambrose.¹ All these studies, however, deal with a proverbial saying rather than an actual practice, and seem to refer the idea to legend or error: in fact, Tatlock's note, in seeking an origin for "the thing," even suggests a misunderstanding of an anecdote about Alexander the Great's dog. No one seems to have associated Chaucer's passage with the evidence that, with certain cautious reservations, lion tamers of the 13th century apparently did beat dogs in order to intimidate their pets. Villard de Honnecourt (fl. 1240) was an architect whose sketch-book, published in facsimile in 1858, shows a wide interest in the science, arts, and customs of his time. G. G. Coulton's *Life in the Middle Ages* (II, 53-54) reproduces a drawing

² See Miss Hammond, *English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey*, Durham, N. C., 1927, p. 472. Since Arcite sallied out "to doon his observaunce to May," his maying is probably on the last regular day of the festival, for Palamon broke gaol after May 1 (see line 1463). Miss Hammond's reference, therefore, lends support to Manly's reading of "the thridde nyght" as "the night preceding the third day." My thanks for good advice are due my colleague, G. H. Gerould.

¹ See Holthausen, *Anglia*, XIV, 320; Lowes, *Archiv*, CXXIV, 132; and Tatlock, *MLN.*, XXXVIII, 506-507.

of a lion-tamer, with its accompanying text, from Villard's book. The lion is chained to a stake, and just beyond his reach stands the trainer with his two dogs. In each hand he has the chain of one of his dogs, and in his right hand he holds also a whip made of several twigs attached to a handle. The Old French text is difficult to make out in Coulton's reproduction of the sketch, but his translation of it runs:

Now will I speak to you of the instruction of the lion. He who would teach the lion hath two dogs. When he would fain make the lion do anything, he commandeth him to do it, and if the lion murmur, then he beateth the dogs; whereof the lion misdoubteth him sore, when he seeth the dogs beaten; wherefore he refraineth his courage and doeth that which hath been commanded. And if the lion be wroth, thereof will I speak no whit, for then would he obey neither for good nor evil usage. And know well that this lion here was portrayed from the life.

The last sentence, together with the general range of contemporary interests in Villard's sketch-book, suggests that he had actually seen this method of lion-taming attempted, and we may infer that Chaucer was referring to a matter of common knowledge and possibly current practice, rather than to a learned proverb of obscure origin.

CALVIN S. BROWN, JR.
ROBERT H. WEST

The University of Georgia

WILLIAM TAYLOR OF NORWICH AND *BEOWULF*

The first edition of *Beowulf*, Thorkelin's *De Danorum Rebus Gestis*, produced only one review in England, by an anonymous writer in the *Monthly Review* in 1816. It seems to have remained unnoticed that this article is identical with the chapter on *Beowulf* in William Taylor's *Historic Survey of German Poetry* (1830), much of the substance of which consisted of former articles, and that it is credited to Taylor in a list of his reviews given in Robberds's amorphous *Memoir*.¹ In this list, which was drawn up by Taylor himself, the name of the editor is spelled *Thorpelin*. Having failed to notice these facts, R. W. Chambers—to take a most dis-

¹ *Memoir of the Life and Writings of the late William Taylor of Norwich*, ii, 469.

tinguished example—calls the reviewer “an anonymous scholar,”² and in his bibliography gives the item twice, in one place saying that it gave an account of *Beowulf* “less inaccurate than Turner’s summary,” in another stating that “Taylor’s attempt is not fortunate, and he often goes wrong where Turner, in his edition of 1820, had got the sense right.”³ These contradictory descriptions of the one article may be resolved by noticing the dates; what had been an advance in 1816 was definitely outdistanced in 1830. Taylor’s account, which as a matter of fact is extremely inaccurate, was a great improvement over that in Turner’s first edition, which had treated Hrothgar and Beowulf as enemies. By means of this review, Taylor, who as an early interpreter of German literature occupies an honorable place in the history of English literature, becomes of some importance in *Beowulf* scholarship. His report of the poem was the best available between 1816 and 1820, and as Chambers says,⁴ he was the first to suggest the identification of the Beaw Scheldwaing of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Beowulf of the poem, a theory which from Kemble’s time on has had a number of adherents.

FRANKLIN COOLEY

University of Maryland

SOURCE OF THE QUOTATION FROM AUGUSTINE IN
THE PARSON'S TALE, 985

The quotation from Augustine, found in *The Parson's Tale*, 985, has never been identified.¹ The passage in question reads: “And herof seith Seint Augustyn: ‘The herte travailleth for shame of his synne’; and for he hath greet shamefastnesse, he is digne to have greet mercy of God.” Miss Petersen suspected that the quotation from Augustine might extend to the end of the sentence.² In

² *Beowulf, An Introduction* (1932), p. 292.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 515 & 539. The summary referred to is in Turner’s *History of the Anglo-Saxons* (1805), iv, 398 ff.

⁴ *Beowulf, An Introduction*, p. 292.

¹ See F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 880.

² See Kate Oelzner Petersen, *The Sources of The Parson's Tale* (Boston, 1901), p. 19, note 2.

this she was right. The passage may be found in Augustine's *Liber de Vera et Falsa Poenitentia*, X, 25: "Laborat enim mens patiando erubescientiam. Et quoniam verecundia magna est poena, qui erubescit pro Christo, fit dignus misericordia."²

KEVIN GUINAGH

Eastern State Teachers College,
Charleston, Illinois

REVIEWS

A Study of Milton's Christian Doctrine. By ARTHUR SEWELL.
London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1939.
Pp. xvi + 214. \$2.50.

The author is not concerned with Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* alone, but with the development and final form of "Milton's Christian doctrine," that is, with the views on theology apparent in all of Milton's writings. The first chapter deals with "The Treatise on Christian Doctrine," its composition, revision, transcription, and the chief heretical passages. The next, entitled Ames and Wollebius, discusses two important sources of Milton's treatise. It is not long enough for full treatment, and apparently contains nothing from Mr. Maurice Kelley's article on Milton and Wollebius (*PMLA*, L, 1935, 156 ff.). The next two chapters are concerned with doctrinal passages in Milton's earlier works, and in *Paradise Lost*, treated at length. Then follows another chapter on *De Doctrina Christiana*, a somewhat philosophical attempt to enter into the mind of the poet and to understand his doctrinal perplexities. This comes after the chapter on *Paradise Lost* because of the author's view that the treatise as we have it is essentially later than the epic. The final chapter deals briefly with the last poems. It accepts the generally accepted but apparently uninvestigated view that *Samson Agonistes* is a late work, in spite of Edward Phillips' assertion: "It cannot certainly be concluded when he wrote his excellent Tragedy entitled *Samson Agonistes*."¹ Until there is some assurance about the date of this drama, arguments on the evolution of Milton's opinions can hardly be founded on it.

As Mr. Sewell points out, much of the treatise is in the hand of Jeremy Pickard, and is altered by cancelations and additions. The first fourteen chapters have been entirely recopied by Daniel

² Migne's *Patrologiae Cursus Completus* 40, 1122.

¹ Helen Darbishire, *The Early Lives of Milton*, London, 1932, p. 75.

Skinner, possibly because they were still more corrected than the later sections. These fourteen chapters also contain a great part of Milton's unorthodox opinion. Mr. Sewell infers, then, that the unorthodoxy of Milton must begin not earlier than 1657, the date assigned for Pickard's first work as secretary. From this follows easily the belief that much of the treatise as it stands is synchronous with or even subsequent to *Paradise Lost*, apparently completed about 1663. Since Mr. Sewell traced the evolution of the treatise in his paper of 1934, he is well aware that its beginnings go back to Milton's youth.

Yet to the belief that "until 1659 (or thereabouts) he [Milton] remained orthodox in many of those points of belief in which later he became most strikingly heterodox" (p. 46), Mr. Sewell's arguments have not converted me. Up to 1641, Milton was Trinitarian. From the prose two later passages are cited as pertinent by Mr. Sewell; I do not know of others. The first is from *Tetrachordon*: "Wee must repaire thither where God professes to teach his servants by the prime institution, and not where we see him intending to dazle sophisters" (Columbia ed., iv. 150). Mr. Sewell concludes that "God who gave the Law is therefore one with Christ of the Gospels." The word *God* refers to Genesis ii. 20-25; is it necessary to make *him* refer clearly to the god of Genesis and to Jesus? But if this passage be admitted to Mr. Sewell, it takes Milton's Trinitarianism to 1645. The passage from *The Treatise of Civil Power*, of 1659, is crucial: "by him redeemd who is God" (Columbia ed., vi. 30). There can be no doubt that Christ is here indicated. But the passage is not out of harmony with the fourteenth chapter of *De Doctrina Christiana*:

Is enim per quem omnia et in terra et in coelo facta sunt, etiam ipsi angeli, qui in principio erat sermo, et apud Deum Deus, etsi non summus, omnis tamen rei creatae primogenitus, ante assumptam carnem extiterit necesse est: quicquid illi qui Christum merum hominem esse disputant, ad haec evadenda subtilius excogitarunt.

Incarnationem autem hanc Christi, qua is, Deus cum esset, humanam naturam assumpsit, caroque factus est, nec tamen unus numero Christus idcirco esse desinit, mysterium religionis nostrae longe maximum esse (Columbia ed., xv. 262).

And later in this chapter we read that the Mediator "Deum atque hominem et dici et esse" (xv. 272).² This fourteenth chapter is

² These passages may be considered in connection with Mr. Sewell's remark, "Milton never speaks of the Son as God in *De Doctrina Christiana*—as *deus*, indeed, but not as *Deus*" (p. 48). I should take them also as applying to a passage discussed by Mr. Sewell (p. 14, and *Essays and Studies*, p. 53) in which Milton writes: "quod dici de Christo minus conveniret, praesertim Deo" (xv. 104, 106). It seems that the translation may be, not especially if he is God, but rather especially when considered as God.

one that apparently Skinner copied because it had been made illegible by alterations in the direction of unorthodoxy (Sewell, p. 4). Hence, the passage in *Of Civil Power*, where Milton contrasts the divine with the human, is wholly within the scope of his most unorthodox opinion. If this be true, we have no Trinitarianism in his prose later than 1645. In other words, Milton did not write as a Trinitarian after he was thirty-seven years of age.

Analogy leads one to expect this. Milton was still younger when he came to hold his great unorthodoxy of divorce. How early we do not know, but the author of the anonymous life says that he held it before he undertook to write on the subject: "The lawfulness and expedience [of divorce] . . . had upon full consideration & reading good authors ben formerly his Opinion."³ How did the anonymous biographer know this? If, as Mr. Sewell holds, he was John Phillips,⁴ he may have heard his uncle express an opinion when dictating the tractate collected from Amesius and Wollebius; on reaching the subject of divorce, Milton would have diverged from their orthodox opinion to his own peculiar views. At any rate, Milton was unorthodox with respect to divorce by the time he was thirty-five. This seems late enough, in the instance of a precocious and independent mind like that of Milton. If at that age he was unorthodox as to divorce, why not as to the Trinity?

Some details may be considered. Quoting *P. L.*, v. 603 ("This day I have begot") Mr. Sewell writes: "On Milton's own showing in *De Doctrina Christiana*, this passage from the poem in no way proves that he believed in the generation of the Son in time" (p. 90). It seems that the following should have been mentioned: "Decreto itaque suo adeoque in tempore genuit Deus Filium; decretum enim praecesserit decreti executionem necesse fuit, id quod adiecta vox *hodie* satis declarat" (Columbia ed., xiv. 188).

On pp. 13-14 and 51-53 there might be a clear statement of the terms "civil law" and "Mosaic law." When Milton uses the former term in the passage quoted, he seems to refer to the laws of nations necessary to civil society. As is stated in *Tetrachordon*, the Mosaic law is evidently not binding on the consciences of Christians, for even a saying of Christ is not to become a "temporal law"; it is to be interpreted "not by the written letter, but by that unerring paraphrase of Christian love and Charity, which is the summe of all commands, and the perfection" (Columbia ed., iv. 186). It would seem that the *De Doctrina Christiana* hardly advanced beyond this position in asserting that the purpose of the Mosaic law is attained in "that love of God and our neighbor, which is born of the Spirit through faith" (xvi. 141).

In reference to the Holy Spirit, Mr. Sewell holds that the invoca-

³ Helen Darbishire, *The Early Lives of Milton*, p. 23.

⁴ I do not accept this identification; see "Some Critical Opinions on Milton," in *SP.*, xxxiii (1936), 529. But Milton's opinion may have been reported by a pupil.

tions in *Paradise Lost* are earlier in Milton's thought than the discussion in *Christian Doctrine*, I. vi; he quotes as parallel to the opening invocation the passage from *Church Government*: "devout prayer to that eternall Spirit who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his Seraphim with the hallow'd fire of his Altar to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases" (Columbia ed., iii. 241). In its context in Isaiah 6, this passage is referred to Jehovah; and Milton held that the Holy Spirit might be the Father (xiv. 362).⁵

Mr. Sewell indicates that his period for study has been limited and that he does not claim finality. Perhaps this explains what appears as a shrinking from detail. For example, there are quotations from the *De Doctrina Christiana* without references, and no index is provided, though the organization of the volume demands one. In general, the author rightly concludes that Milton's mind was not highly philosophical; yet I am not able to feel that the work under review is sufficiently thorough to be considered important. Moreover, in addition to what appears to me the fundamental error in dating the poet's unorthodoxy, there is also a fault in method, namely the assumption that passages in the poetry are to be interpreted in the same way as those in the treatise. Milton was at some pains to point out that logic is the closed fist, rhetoric the open hand, and that poetry is still "less subtle and fine" than rhetoric and "more simple, sensuous and passionate." Moreover, in poetry Milton feels free to use any Biblical passage he finds convenient, and does not need to supply a commentary; it is not strange that, as Mr. Sewell remarks, "eighteenth-century theologians could find *Paradise Lost ex omne parte orthodoxum*" (p. 81), and that this view was disturbed only on the publication of *De Doctrina Christiana*.

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

The Miltonic Setting, Past & Present. By E. M. W. TILLYARD. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938. Pp. xii + 208. \$2.75.

Milton on Himself. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by JOHN S. DIEKHOF. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xxxvi + 307. \$3.50.

The nine essays in Dr. Tillyard's volume are unified by the two themes stated in the title. Four of the essays (forming slightly more than half of the book) had previously been printed but deserve a wider audience. The first of these, Dr. Tillyard's brilliant

⁵ As to the Bible, this is limited by Milton with the words *Sub Evangelio*.

English Association pamphlet of 1932, removes "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" forever from the Horton period and puts them into Milton's Cambridge experience. The argument leaves little to add, although one might suggest that the Latin verses from the Commonplace Book were possibly an abortive poetic exercise on the theme of the First Prolusion, abandoned in favor of "L'Allegro."

In a review of Grierson's *Milton and Wordsworth* and in an unpublished essay on "Milton and Protestantism" we are reminded, with some useful definitions of terms, that Milton was centrally an evangelical protestant. The Warton Lecture of 1936, tracing the epic background of Milton, is also reprinted. Two hitherto unpublished essays reply to modern detractors of Milton. Combatting the view that the poet's sensibility was simple and impoverished, Tillyard speaks "in terms of different mental levels," finding that while Milton's "unconscious" was exceptionally adjusted to the forces of life, he "owes much of his greatness to being close to primitive and elemental habits of mind." Tillyard rather inadequately answers T. S. Eliot's contention that Milton fails to give us the "feeling of being in a particular place at a particular time" with four examples of Milton's giving us that feeling. While not completely denying Eliot's further charge that Milton is deficient in sensuous appreciation, he is successful in qualifying the statement.

Two other essays deal largely with Milton and Keats, and Middleton Murry's theory of the latter's rejection of a Miltonic style is devastatingly attacked. Parallels in the mental growth of the two poets are stressed, and Tillyard repeats his illuminating if oversimplified exposition of "Lycidas" while comparing it to the "Ode to a Nightingale" in structure and theme. Additional charges against Milton's style—remote grandeur, inorganic method, latinization—are shrewdly analyzed and answered.

The final essay, "The Growth of Milton's Epic Plans," seems to me the weakest. Having several times accused Eliot of reading Milton out of his context, Tillyard here falls into the same easy error, finding the poet in the "Vacation Exercise" enumerating "three types of poetry he would like to turn his chief talents to," "weighing in his mind two kinds of 'epic.'" This literalness characterizes also Tillyard's reading of the *Elegia Sexta*, which here and in his second essay he interprets as a "personal self-dedication" to the writing of epic poetry. It is ironic that the keen critic who first noticed the connection between "L'Allegro" and the First Prolusion should have overlooked the spirit and method of an academic exercise in Milton's Latin letter to his fellow-student, Diodati.

If I may put the case briefly, Milton turns his friend's excuse for not composing verse into the theme of a rhetorical "debate," discussing each side learnedly from a single point of view. For thirty-three lines, in what E. K. Rand calls "a pretty vein of banter," he

defends the thesis that song and feasting belong together, citing various authorities and illustrations—as he had been taught to do. The authorities are deities in classical mythology; the illustrations are Greek and Latin poets—and (a felicitous touch) Diodati himself! Finally the theme is enlarged: poetry belongs not only with feasting, but also with music, dancing, and love. There is a six-line summary which returns to the main theme: many gods patronize the elegiac poet, for whom feasting is proper. In representing the case for temperance (the original statement of it was Diodati's) Milton needs only twenty-five lines. His method is the same, although his tone, obeying the laws of decorum, changes from cheerful to grave. It is the epic poet who must live sparingly. Confronted with the difficulty of citing authorities for spare living among the Greek *gods*, Milton, instead of turning to the Bible, apparently invents a few appropriate details about Tiresias, Linus, Calchas, and Orpheus. As an illustration he does not mention Virgil, but, contradicting Horace and (to a certain extent) his own later account in the *Apology*, he offers the Homer of the *Odyssey*. He does not mention himself as an aspirant to epic honors (although he had cited Diodati as an elegiac poet), but gives Pythagoras as an example of living sparingly, and uses him to enlarge his theme again (as he had used Diodati in the first argument). Besides temperance, epic poetry also belongs with purity, chastity, and blameless behavior. This side of the "debate," like the preceding, ends by pointing out that the bard is sacred to the gods. Every element in the defence of feasting is present in the shorter defence of temperance. The parallelism is not precise, but neither is it in "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso." Yet Dr. Tillyard would here, I think, make Milton "Il Penseroso" and not "L'Allegro." Although he is far from alone in this interpretation, he has drawn more inferences from it than any other student of Milton, and I find it one of the few blemishes in his valuable study of *The Miltonic Setting*.

Mr. Diekhoff collects those passages of verse and prose in which Milton writes of himself or his work. The idea is not a new one; Henry Corson made a similar selection in 1899, and in 1872 J. G. Graham published an *Autobiography of John Milton, or Milton's Life in His Own Words*. Like his predecessors Diekhoff sees fit to modernize spelling and punctuation. Unlike them he had the text of the *Columbia Milton* to select from, he has tried to collect *all* the excerpts, and he has wisely omitted dubious passages, choosing only those in which Milton avowedly is autobiographical. In this book, for a change, Samson and Satan cease being Milton, and attention is at last paid to Milton's warning in the *Defensio Prima* (which, oddly enough, Diekhoff does not quote): "We must not regard the poet's words as his own, but consider who it is that speaks."

Some readers may object to Diekhoff's admittedly arbitrary

classification of the extracts into fourteen groups; but the editor is surely right in saying: "To arrange Milton's words into a coherent chronological account of his life is impossible, I think; to present them in the order of their composition would result in chaos." If we must have *Milton on Himself*, we must have some subject classification such as this editor gives us, and we may thank him for frequent cross reference and useful notes.

Although it seems to Mr. Diekhoff "above all things desirable that Milton should be allowed to speak for himself," a 24-page introduction offers guidance to the reader. Here one may be permitted occasionally to differ with the editor. It is well to be reminded, for example, of Mary Powell's influence on Milton's thought, but we cannot agree that Milton's failure to speak of her in print is "significant." On the other hand, Mr. Diekhoff defends his author's trustworthiness in autobiography with truly uncommon commonsense.

WILLIAM R. PARKER

The Ohio State University

Defoe's Review. Reproduced from the Original Editions, with an Introduction and Bibliographical Notes by ARTHUR WELLESLEY SECORD. Nine vols. in twenty-two facsimile books. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. \$88.00. (Publication No. 44 of the Facsimile Text Society).

The reissue of Defoe's *Review*, by far the most ambitious project hitherto undertaken by the Facsimile Text Society, now stands complete as a most remarkable piece of coöperative scholarship. An eighteenth century newspaper file extending to over 5600 pages and running continuously for over nine years is something that a library or a collector can seldom hope to acquire. Any library, indeed, which tries to meet the needs of students of eighteenth century literature and history would be glad to take this much primary material, good, bad, and indifferent, at less than a cent and a half a page. Yet the mere bulk of the matter and the rarity of the file are not the most noteworthy things about this edition.

The project has had an interesting history. First proposed by the Facsimile Text Society in 1929, it was revived in 1933 and successfully underwritten by subscription. Thereupon the bibliographical problems connected with the *Review* were attacked as they never had been before. The late Professor Greenough did important spadework, although ill health finally forced him to withdraw. Professor Secord, who had been active at all stages of the undertaking, then took over the editorship. Eventually the most important American sets, those in the possession of the Boston Public Library (Trent

Collection), Mr. Arch W. Shaw, the University of Texas Library, and the Yale University Library were brought together for study. As Secord writes, "Since Defoe's day, probably so many sets have not been together or another Defoe investigator had such an opportunity as I to compare them." While this comparison could not of course extend to all the minutiae of the text, it has led to a precise description of the structure of a complete set of the *Review*, the recording of significant variations, a systematic account of the Edinburgh edition, and many other important contributions. All future study of the *Review* will be based on Secord's Introduction and Bibliographical Notes.

In selecting texts for reproduction it was necessary to choose a page now from one set, now from another, as more suitable for photographing. The disadvantage of this arrangement has been largely offset by check-lists which indicate the provenience of each page, and the advantage is that the physical discomfort of reading an eighteenth century newspaper is reduced to a minimum. Inevitably some pages are smudged and in a few cases the type curves at the binding edge. The unevenness of color from page to page and on a single page is, as a notice in the Introduction says, approximately reproduced, but against the white background such variations do not seriously affect legibility. The division of the nine volumes into twenty-two facsimile books is a happy arrangement; it will be a pleasant and novel experience for readers of eighteenth century newspapers to handle these light and manageable books instead of the clumsy volumes in which such material is often bound up.

Most students have had to take a great part of Defoe on trust, although they must have felt qualms about their dependence on second-hand reports. To a certain extent they will have to continue to do so, unless they are near one of the large collections and qualify as specialists in Defoe and his times; but this reprint goes far toward mending matters for the scholar who wants a sound though not minutely specialized knowledge of the subject. The effect of newspaper-reading is cumulative; the policy of an editor, his endless reiteration of favorite ideas, and his shifts of direction and emphasis work out as a practical initiation into his age. At first it may seem that this is largely surface-play, but soon we detect important currents of ideas as well, when we have to do with a man like Defoe. His disingenuousness does not utterly discredit him. The *Review* is a political organ, Harley is always to be reckoned with, and the reader will get some practice in analyzing speciousness as he follows Defoe's utterances through months and years on such subjects as the prospect of peace, the position of the Church in Scotland, and the attitude which a good Williamite is to take toward the government of 1710. The attempt at political manipulation of the dissenting interest was inevitable. There is something hollow in Defoe's quick assumption of position after position which

shall mollify the Dissenters and at the same time help Harley. He shows gratuitous zeal against the theater, especially in Volume III. He is too ready to portray himself as virtuous and persecuted. But there is no mistaking his eagerness to get on to something more substantial. Throughout Volume VII he advertises a project for a review to be entirely devoted to trade, since "the fury of the times" keeps him from treating that subject adequately in the present periodical. Professor Moore, drawing largely on the *Review*, has already shown the underlying consistency and importance of Defoe's economic views.¹ When Defoe discusses the nature of credit, government finance, poor relief, bankruptcy and imprisonment for debt, foreign and colonial trade, he is never tired of reiterating his favorite ideas and always furnishes abundant copy for the printer. There are many cross-references to his other works—to the hostile discussion of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in *The Poor Man's Plea* and the long satire called *Reformation of Manners*, to *The True-Born Englishman*, *The Shortest Way*, and *The Consolidator*; and there are interesting outcroppings of subject-matter which reappear in his later works on travel and economics and in his fiction as well. The hitherto inaccessible Volume IX gives important new evidence about his troubles in connection with the two ironical pamphlets of 1713, *What if the Pretender Should Come?* and *Reasons against the Succession of the House of Hanover*. But it is impossible to anticipate the working of this rich mine of material.

The student will be glad to restudy the familiar theme of the relation of the *Review* to the other periodicals of the age, and can now examine at leisure the famous "Advice to the Scandal. Club" and its successor the *Little Review*. Defoe seems to be embarrassed at finding that the entertaining question-and-answer method which he took over from Dunton threatens to divert him from his primary political purpose. He does not go far toward admitting a casual variety of light topics and enlisting the coöperation of his interested readers; he professes to be impatient at the humor of the age which will not allow him to treat one subject continuously. He hails Isaac Bickerstaff as one who has taken over the office of the Scandal. Club (VI, No. 141, March 2, 1710), but he thinks that such a reformer must deal with a "mass of filth." Thereafter he himself is influenced by the *Tatler* and later the *Spectator*, but he has his doubts about the efficacy of the light touch of Steele and Addison. "The *Tattler* and *Spectator*, that happy Favourite of the Times, has pleas'd you all; . . . But alas! Are we to be laugh'd out of our Follies?" (VIII, No. 61, August 14, 1711).

The Rice Institute

ALAN D. MCKILLOP

¹ John Robert Moore, *Daniel Defoe and Modern Economic Theory*, Bloomington, Ind., 1935. Indiana University Studies, XXI, No. 104.

The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex. By JOHN BANKS.
Edited by THOMAS MARSHALL HOWE BLAIR. New York:
Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 62 + sig. A 1-4
+ pp. 80 + pp. 63—148. \$2.75.

In this, the first edition of *The Unhappy Favourite: or The Earl of Essex* since 1769, Mr. T. M. H. Blair has revived for the modern reader the earliest English play on the romantic theme of Elizabeth and Essex. Following Mr. Allardyce Nicoll, he considers the author, John Banks, as the forerunner of Nicholas Rowe in the discovery of the "she-tragedy," with its exploitation of heroines rather than heroes, its opportunities for the new actresses of the Restoration, its continual accent on pathos, and its direct appeal to the female part of the audience. This estimate of Banks's originality as the discoverer of "she-tragedy" would seem to be historically justified, although the phrase was not the invention of Nicoll, as Blair implies, but was rather used by Rowe himself, at least as early as his epilogue to *Jane Shore*. Although *The Unhappy Favourite* is not a full-fledged example of the type, since Essex engages its author's attention even more than does Elizabeth, it marks the path which Banks was later to follow in his attempt at feminization of the theater and in his patriotic interest in themes of English history as opposed to the foreign material of most of his heroic contemporaries.

The main text consists of a photo-offset facsimile of the 1682 edition. This method both recreates the atmosphere of an original and avoids the usual human errors attendant on a reproduction in modern type. It would have been well, however, to devote a special section to the correction of the errors in the original text rather than to run these corrections in with the rest of the notes, where they seem alien. Moreover, some of these errors have been overlooked, as in the case of "Dop" for "Drop" in the epilogue.

The notes afford a valuable running commentary on most of Banks's plays, their sources, and adaptations, but especially on the Elizabeth and Essex story on the stage from Thomas Corneille to Maxwell Anderson. On the other hand, they might sometimes deal more thoroughly with the text itself than they do. For instance, if—as on page 72—it seems desirable to comment on Banks's use of *straight* as an adverb, it would seem even more desirable to deal with the allusion to St. Christopher a little further on in the same scene. Somewhat similarly, a reference in the epilogue to the visions of the "Hatfield Maid" is explained by quoting from Montague Summers, but a reference to the prophecies of the astrologer, William Lilly, a few lines earlier is passed over silently.

Mr. Blair has also provided his edition with several useful introductory sections. For his biographical material he acknowledges

his indebtedness to the work of Roswell G. Ham, Thomas A. Kirby, and Fred S. Tupper. Since these data are very meager, however, it would seem probable that further investigation of the records, such as those of the Middle Temple, might have produced additional information about the little-known Banks.

Perhaps the most interesting section to the general reader is that which discusses the origin and development of the widely accepted but unfounded tradition of the ring which the queen gave her unhappy favorite to use in any desperate emergency. In the search for an explanation of this romantic episode, however, one wonders whether the whole affair does not have a conventional background. It might, at least, have been worth while to look for parallels to the situation in earlier fiction and plays.

Students of the drama will be grateful to Mr. Blair for making *The Unhappy Favourite* easily available to them and for calling their attention again to his popular old tragedy, with all its fustian echoes of the heroic play. Perhaps, however, they may be pardoned for hesitating to second his pious hope that some day Banks may again be brought before the footlights.

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

Northwestern University

"Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Perceval-roman." Von WILHELM KELLERMANN. Beiheft zur *ZRP* LXXXVIII (Halle, Niemeyer). Pp. 232.

Ce travail d'un débutant, élève de M. A. Hämel à Wurzburg et privatdozent à cette université, est déjà d'un maître.¹ À une connaissance intime de tout ce qui s'est écrit en France et en Allemagne et à une familiarité en plus avec les travaux des médiévistes germanisants (qui ont introduit la *Geistesgeschichte* dans ce genre d'études) s'unit chez M. Kellermann une finesse d'observation non commune du donné dans une oeuvre littéraire, et un sens intime des particularités de la pensée médiévale, qu'il s'agit de comprendre, sans l'altérer en la modernisant ni légiférer au nom de préjugés. Le bannissement de tout anachronisme équivaut à l'atteinte de la vérité profonde de l'époque traitée. En partant du réel observable, toute la spéculation de l'auteur se borne à raccorder et harmoniser les traits en apparence discordants et à les intégrer dans une vue systématique de ce que peut être, étant donnée la pensée du moyen âge, telle oeuvre d'art l'exprimant. Son livre,—ne traitant que d'un seul livre, ce *Perceval* de Chrétien, et ne se laissant distraire de sa tâche ni par le biographisme, le *sourcisme*, le chauvinisme litté-

¹ Il a publié un article suggestif sur "Altdeutsche und altfranzösische Litteratur" dans *GRM* xxv (1938).

raire (d'un G. Cohen), ni par des jugements tous faits dans le style des germanisants allemands d'antan qui aimaient rabaisser Chrétien en faveur de Hartmann ou Wolfram,—réussit, précisément par l'investigation *profonde* de la structure et de l'atmosphère vitale de ce roman, non seulement à éclairer le *Perceval*, mais toute l'oeuvre de Chrétien et à percer un jour sur cette architecture artistique de l'art laïque du XII^e siècle: avec M. Kellermann, nous sommes dans l'atelier cérébral du poète et nous nous mouvons avec aisance dans ce monde clos, mais diaphane. Je ne connais aucune oeuvre sur un texte médiéval, qui, en limitant si strictement les recherches à un domaine plutôt restreint: la composition (*Aufbaustil*) et l'organisation de la vue du monde exprimée (*Weltbild*) dans le *Perceval*—l'étude des sources est supposée, mais elles-mêmes sont en principe éliminées, de même l'étude de la langue que l'auteur nous promet de faire suivre,—arrive à des vues aussi complexes sur l'art médiéval en général. Les devanciers de notre auteur auront été MM. Reto Bezzola (qui a synthétisé les opinions opposées de G. Paris et de Foerster), et les germanisants G. Müller, Ehrismann et Witte. Les deux notions figurant au titre n'expriment au fond qu'une même chose, vue une fois du dehors, une fois du dedans: la composition du *Perceval* doit évidemment correspondre à l'idée que se faisait le poète du monde en le traduisant en oeuvre épique. Chrétien apparaît comme excellent 'compositeur' dès qu'on a approfondi sa vue du monde. Et viceversa: en remontant à l'unité de son roman, on s'aperçoit de la cohérence de son panorama moral. La tautologie qui résulte de cet 'aller et retour' du critique, n'est pas pour nous décourager: elle est la garantie de la véracité de son interprétation.

Le *Perceval* est, d'après M. Kellermann, une oeuvre *courtoise*, mais à envergure plus haute que les autres oeuvres de Chrétien, puisqu'elle met en action les valeurs religieuses sans nier les valeurs courtoises. Ici la notion du "gradualisme" médiéval, tel que M. Günther Müller l'a défini, s'impose: les valeurs courtoises *subsistent* à leur place, même si la pensée religieuse est d'un ordre plus élevé (on pourrait ici opposer l'hierarchie des valeurs du *Polyeucte* de Corneille où l'échelon supérieur exclut ou détruit nettement l'inférieur). Perceval comme chevalier du *Graal* est supérieur à Gauvain, le héros courtois typique qui pourrait trouver sa place dans n'importe quel autre roman du maître de Troyes, sa courbe d'évolution, dessinée par la Providence, est plus longue et monte plus haut, mais il reste pourtant toujours le héros courtois: nulle mystique ni nul symbolisme supposés ne doivent nous laisser perdre de vue ce point essentiel. Perceval, préludé par Erec et Yvain, n'est ni un mystique ni un ascète (G. Cohen), mais reste chevalier (et le roman n'est naturellement non plus, exagération contraire de M. Wilmotte, un livre d'amusement sceptique, voltairien). Le roman de Perceval, oeuvre épique, non didactique, sera donc, avec le héros n° 1, Perceval, le premier *Entwicklungsroman*

ou roman d'éducation, en même temps qu'il sera encore, avec Gauvain, un autre de ces *Ereignisroman*, de ces romans d'aventures médiévaux. M. Kellermann montre les fortes attaches qui unissent l'action de Perceval à la cour du roi Artus, p. ex. les grandes scènes de cour marquant les césures de son développement intérieur—comme dans les autres romans de Chrétien (de là des inférences sur une grande scène finale à la cour qui nous manque dans le fragment conservé). Chrétien, bien entendu, en vrai épique "objectif," met en action (sans nous donner de programme ni de théorie) le développement de son héros: il subordonne l'éclaircissement du lecteur à sa tension (*Spannung*), p. ex. dans la mention si tardive du nom du protagoniste. Le caractère du héros ne dirige pas l'action, mais est plutôt explicité par elle: il n'y a donc de 'psychologie' que subordonnée à la volonté électrice de Dieu; Chrétien nous donne des 'aventures' se succédant dont nous ne devons chercher le fil conducteur qu' "après coup," en rebroutant chemin pour ainsi dire: la volonté de la Providence devient claire quand à la fin nous pouvons mesurer le chemin parcouru par Perceval, qui n'est clair dès l'abord ni à lui ni à nous. Les 'motivations' du poète auront donc plusieurs 'plans' (*Schichten*), selon que nous voulons comprendre la trame extérieure et accidentelle du récit ou ses raisons éthico-religieuses plus profondes: Perceval arrive par hasard au manoir du *graal* où il ne prononce pas les questions que la situation semble requérir—mais pour le poète ce hasard n'en est pas un: il était élu pour délivrer le vieux roi, mais la faute inexpiée (son manque de cœur vis-à-vis de sa mère, morte depuis de chagrin) lui lie la langue. Les valeurs morales qui animent les deux protagonistes sont au fond en harmonie avec le triptyque médiéval du *utile*, *honestum* et du *summum bonum*: Gauvain arrive aux deux premiers, Perceval seul conquiert le dernier. Dans un dernier chapitre, moins original, je crois, M. Kellermann esquisse son opinion, moins sur "le sens du *graal*" (puisque aussi bien nous n'en savons pas beaucoup d'après l'état du fragment), que sur la genèse du roman par une synthèse due à Chrétien, d'un 'conte du *nicelot*,' d'un roman arthurien et d'une légende chrétienne: l'harmonisation de ces éléments aboutit à un 'roman à évolution' courtois, à base de la conception augustinienne de la *felix culpa*, incarnée dans Perceval. Robert de Boron a insisté bien davantage sur le côté théologique et symbolique et, probablement, s'est servi de Chrétien; Wolfram a créé un personnage plus tragique, moins classiquement mesuré que le héros de Chrétien, puisque ne se sachant pas pécheur et révolté contre un Dieu qu'il doit croire injuste.

Remarques:

p. 35: le passage d'Erec vv. 13-14 (*et tret d'une bone aventure une mout bele conjointure*) me semble mieux interprété par M. Nitze (que Kellermann ne mentionne pas), *Rom.* XLIV, p. 16.

p. 87: les *tant que* (lors s'esleisse parmi le bois tant con cele trace li dure, tant que il vit par aventure une pucele soz un chesne), si fréquents dans le *Perceval*, sont pour notre auteur un procédé de style inhérent à la technique de l'«aventure»: le héros est conduit soi-disant *par aventure*, mais en vérité par une nécessité épique, à un lieu où d'après le plan de l'œuvre un événement important doit arriver. D'autre part, Mlle A. Hatcher montre dans un article "Consecutive Clauses in OF," qui paraîtra sous peu, que ce type de phrases introduites par *tant que* est un cliché de l'ancienne littérature épique, qui tend à représenter toute action (comme tout héros) dans le cadre d'un moule (*pattern*) idéal (c'est l'idée que M. Kellermann énonce à la p. 136: "Die Lebensanschauung des hochmittelalterlichen Dichters ist vielmehr auf feste Normen hin ausgerichtet"). Au lieu de *tant que* on pourrait substituer le *si bien que* de La Fontaine annonçant une étape ultérieure d'un devenir: le héros ne peut qu'accomplir tout l'humainement possible, il doit aller aussi loin que *cele trace li dure, tant qu'il arrive* au lieu à lui prédestiné, et le conteur, montrant ici comme en d'autres occasions le bout de l'oreille, se réjouit, avec Chrétien ou La Fontaine, de ce développement idéal (chez La Fontaine quelquefois ironisé).

p. 138: la conception de l'«aventure» chez Chrétien aurait gagné en relief historique si M. Kellermann l'avait comparée à celle de Marie de France, v. Elena Eberwein, "Zum Problem der mittelalterlichen Existenz" (Bonn 1932).

p. 139: sur le problème *puer senex* cf. maintenant E. R. Curtius, *ZRP* 1938.

p. 142: *ne sai l'œuvre asomer* n'est pas tellement en contradiction avec *n'an tot le monde n'a maçon qui miaux devisast la façon del chastel*. Ce sont deux formules toutes faites, typiques et typisantes, du panégyrisme médiéval.

p. 164: une des idées les plus malheureuses qui aient été lancées dans le domaine médiéval est l'idée, que notre auteur a faite sienne, de M. Franz, sur la "reflektierte Handlung" dans la littérature narrative du moyen âge français, censée tendre à un effet, une "pose" plus ou moins théâtrale et calculée, "réfléchie": cette même idée a produit des erreurs néfastes dans le travail, d'ailleurs méritoire, de Mlle Ruth Hoppe sur les "gestes" dans le *Roland*: si un héros médiéval fait un geste ou accomplit une action impressionnante, il n'est pas encore dit que *ce personnage* ait calculé lui-même l'impression produite—c'est tout simplement l'auteur qui a su créer d'une façon impressionnante.

p. 165: je m'étonne que M. Kellermann n'ait vu que de la vaine apparence ("Schein") dans les passages où la gloire du héros est la 'sanction de la prouesse.' On sait de reste combien la *fama* était inhérente à la conception de l'honneur chez les scolastiques et que M. Castro a prouvé la survivance de ce code d'honneur, pour nous assez extérieur, dans la *comedia* du *siglo de oro* espagnol. A ajouter le *locus communis* du panégyrique médiéval de la *bonne chanson* que tout héros brigue.

p. 199 seq.: je ne vois pas de rapport entre la prière égrenant les *noms de Dieu* que murmure l'hermite, et la prière épique à récapitulations de cas où Dieu a sauvé des hommes ou accompli de miracles. Là il y a vraiment une prière de magicien qui veut exorciser, ici une prière dont au moins le schéma est orthodoxe (biblique). D'ailleurs les *noms de Dieu* sont aussi mentionnés dans la chanson de geste (*Roland*) et seront donc un reste de 'religion populaire' dans le *Perceval*.

p. 204: je ne comprends pas la sanction, par notre auteur, de cette leçon faite au moyen âge par M. Winkler au sujet du prétendu manque de confiance dans les forces morales de l'individu ("Er [le poète médiéval] ebnete seinem Publikum *allzu* willfährig den Weg der Überkompensation . . . er nahm dem Erlebnis den Reiz der Leistung") et je ne puis adhérer à la caractérisation citée de Bernard de Clairvaux "der in Kampfsinn und

Eigen-sinn wie *im rötlichen Blondhaar und in der leuchtenden Parzival-haut* [c'est moi qui souligne] das Erbe seiner germanischen Ahnen bewahrte"—sommes-nous dans un *Rassenamt* hitlérien? Et, vaille que vaille, les deux traits physiques cités ne seraient-ils pas plus appropriés à la description physique—d'un juif polonais?

p. 218: sur *graal*, d'abord appellatif, puis nom propre cf. mes constatations sur la labilité qui règne au moyen âge entre ces deux classes grammaticales (la *trotaconventos* de l'archiprêtre de Hita, v. *Ztschr.* 1934, p. 263, et la *beatrice* du Dante, *Trav. sém. d'Istanbul* I, p. 162).

p. 226: à l'encontre de ce que l'auteur avait avancé avant, il semble admettre que Chrétien ait nommé son roman, non *Perceval*, mais *roman du Graal*.

LEO SPITZER

A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709. By HENRIETTA C. BARTLETT and ALFRED W. POLLARD. Revised and Extended by HENRIETTA C. BARTLETT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. v + 165. \$10.00.

The twenty-three years since 1916, when Miss Bartlett and Dr. Pollard first published their *Census*, have wrought a greater change in the ownership of rare books than any other like period in the history of book collecting. The conditions brought about by the war of 1914-18 have resulted in the dispersal of many private collections and the formation of new collections both private and public. It is therefore not surprising that Miss Bartlett is now able to add extensively to the recorded number of Shakespeare quartos. That she has raised the number from 875 to 1206 is an indication of the vigor and thoroughness of her recent investigations.

Of the seven largest collections of Shakespeare quartos, three—the British Museum (101), Trinity College Cambridge (51), and the New York Public Library (34)—have given but little trouble in the revision, for they were for the most part formed before 1916. A comparison of the holdings, in 1916 and in 1939, of the other four great collections reveals their notable growth during that period: Folger from 124 to 205, Huntington from 87 to 125, Bodleian from 59 to 77, Harvard from 2 to 57.

In addition to recording newly-discovered quartos and changes of ownership since 1916, Miss Bartlett has been able personally to examine many copies previously inaccessible and hence known to her only through sale catalogues or descriptions communicated to her by owners or librarians—notably the Crichton-Stuart and the Folger copies. This has now enabled her not only to describe these copies fully and accurately, but also correctly to allocate to the right edition many copies previously so imperfectly described as to make it impossible to determine to which edition they belonged. She has, it may be added, thoroughly checked all of her old descriptions and, in the relatively few cases in which it was necessary, corrected and expanded them, especially with respect to provenance.

It is regrettable that such a careful and valuable revision should be marred by Miss Bartlett's failure at several points to achieve a completeness not at all beyond her reach. In her brief introduction she observes that the first edition of the *Census* omitted *The First Part of the Contention* (2 *Henry VI*) and *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of York* (3 *Henry VI*) because they were then generally believed to be non-Shakespearian, and that though now regarded as Shakespeare's own work they are yet omitted in the revision. The omission again of *Pericles* she excuses because of Lee's census—now thirty-four years old. Less important but quite as hard to understand is her failure to distinguish between the three 1703 editions of *Hamlet*, for the existence and correct order of which she cites (pp. 14-15) H. N. Paul in *MLN.*, "June 6, 1934" (read xlix (1934), 369-75). It is quite true, as Miss Bartlett points out, that the title-pages can scarcely be distinguished, but she herself cites textual variants sufficient to have enabled any owner or librarian to determine for her to which edition or editions his copies belong. Lastly, the omission of the excellent introduction to the first edition of the *Census*, which would have required little revision, will be felt as a heavy loss by those who do not possess that earlier edition. This especially deserves mention in view of the somewhat misleading quotation, on the dust wrapper of the new edition, of a review of the edition of 1916 which calls particular attention to the introduction.

GILES E. DAWSON

Folger Shakespeare Library

Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Biographical Study. By E. K. CHAMBERS. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1938 and 1939. Pp. xvi + 373. \$7.00.

Organic Unity in Coleridge. By GORDON MCKENZIE. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939. \$1.00. (University of California Publications in English, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 1-108.)

When, in 1934, Sir Edmund Chambers published a paper entitled "Some Dates in Coleridge's *Annus Mirabilis*" his readers did not suspect the extensiveness of his journey into romantic fields. Surprise and curiosity greeted the announcement, four years later, that he was writing a complete life of Coleridge. Curiosity about the temporary shift of interests may persist, but surprise has given place to a high degree of satisfaction with the biography.

Unquestionably we have here a book that will prove indispensable

as a reliable and sorely needed work of ready reference. Turning to any period of Coleridge's life we may choose, we find a compact narrative based largely on his own works and letters, and on pertinent letters, diaries and miscellaneous accounts written by his contemporaries. Sir Edmund has availed himself of innumerable pieces of detailed research made by Coleridge scholars, ancient and modern, and has included full references to these in his foot-notes. The notes, in fact, do much more than substantiate his narrative; they furnish, as the publishers indicate, admirable bibliographies for further reading on special topics. The table of references to printed sources might well have been supplemented by a descriptive list of manuscripts referred to from time to time, but the use made of manuscript materials is so slight that the omission is not a serious one.

A remarkably skilful synthesis of heterogeneous evidence, keenly evaluated, is what Sir Edmund has given us. The table of contents may be slightly misleading: chapter headings such as "Bread and Cheese," "The Journalist," and "On the Wing" suggest more interpretation than the book actually offers, and something of the pleasant discursiveness of Lawrence Hanson's biography rather than the business-like continuity of this.

Occasionally the author has argued some moot question at length and given his own judgment on the matter. For example, he has included a four-page account of critical controversies over the dating of "Kubla Khan," carefully examining the evidence and making a good case for his own conclusion that the poem was probably composed in October, 1797, very possibly between the 12th and the 14th. Such passages are rare, but the same sort of close study and reasoning has gone into biographical details that are not elaborated at length.

With all its compactness, the book is thoroughly interesting reading for any one who wants an up-to-date account of the facts of Coleridge's life and a picture of the man in many of his ordinary relationships. Naturally, no one would look to it for an idealization of the poet-philosopher. Moreover, no one should expect to find in it a thorough history of Coleridge's intellectual development. Such a study as Earl Griggs's comparison of the 1809 and 1818 editions of "The Friend," with its deductions as to changes in Coleridge's intellectual interests, is foreign to Sir Edmund's methods, though he does make mention of some of the obvious differences between the two versions. Sir Edmund gives the impression, in fact, of having little interest in Coleridge's prose, or in the general run of his poetry, except as these offer strictly biographical material. His inclusion, in an appendix, of eight hitherto unpublished letters is in line with the concern for detailed biographical evidence that is shown throughout.

It would be difficult to find a study of Coleridge more directly antithetical to Sir Edmund Chambers' than the monograph "Or-

ganic Unity in Coleridge" by Gordon McKenzie of the University of California. In the latter book biography is ignored when it does not bear obviously on the conflict between the "heart" and the "head" that supposedly conditioned Coleridge's critical method; chronology is practically ignored; the bibliography is limited. It is a very general, but thoughtful, study of an abstract philosophical principle, showing its importance in Coleridge's system and technique of criticism. The present reviewer, remembering her own far inferior attempt to expound Coleridge's critical use of the principle of the reconciliation of opposites, hesitates to make any adverse criticisms; but it must be said that work recently done in the history of ideas and in detailed Coleridge scholarship makes McKenzie's method and his results seem rather less valuable than would have been the case a few years ago. This is not to deny the importance of the birds-eye view that he gives or of many very illuminating passages. The book is well worth the reading of all serious students of Coleridge's criticism.

McKenzie says that it apparently did not occur to Coleridge that the principle of organic unity and that of the reconciliation of opposites were in conflict, or that "although both were idealistic, formed of the same stuff, they represented different systems of thought." I believe that Coleridge's "Hints toward the Formation of a more Comprehensive Theory of Life," and especially a MS fragment apparently designed for this essay and then discarded (cf. *MLN.*, May, 1932), showed him in the process of wrestling with the two principles and trying to reconcile them. The fact that he was not more obviously troubled by the conflict may perhaps be explained by his belief that new definitions of organic life were paving the way for a resolution. The question is an important one, and I am glad that it has been raised in this monograph.

Alice D. Snyder

Vassar College

Pride and Passion, Robert Burns 1759-1796. By DELANCY FERGUSON. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xxii + 321. \$3.00.

Free from the acute embarrassment characteristic of so many of his predecessors, gifted with a pungent style, and writing under a plan which allows him to omit the trivial and to emphasize Burns' leading qualities and his relation to his time, Professor Ferguson takes his place in the very select circle of those who have tried to present Burns fully and to present him whole. And he succeeds the better in that he knows the more, for while the book is brisk and popular, and necessarily summary in its method, its sound and

comprehensive scholarship cannot be too strongly emphasized. For instance, in the chapter on Women, Professor Ferguson gives the first complete and reasonably weighted account of Burns' heroines and of the girl he finally married. A good example of the "pith o' sense" in this chapter is the remark on Highland Mary, "In view of the social attitude of the Ayrshire peasantry the question of whether or not Mary was technically chaste is both metaphysical and irrelevant." Similarly *Pride and Passion* has done a great service in shifting emphasis from the evil done Burns by his much publicized tavern-companions, to the much more serious damage done him by well-intentioned and well-born acquaintances. In fact, on the whole matter of Burns' dissipations, Professor Ferguson speaks shrewdly when he says, "If Burns dissipated heavily he managed somehow to do it without heavy expenditure, an art few people have learned."

Throughout the book one is continually struck by its excellent good sense and balance. Despite his great charm, Burns' "inverted snobbery" certainly antagonized people who could have made life easier for him. From youth his pride, his unruly passions, his "skinless sensibility," his desire to shine and to shock got him into far more trouble than his dissipation. But too seldom does a biographer emphasize as equally important Burns' sense of responsibility to his family (his brother and sisters and mother, as well as his wife and children), his loyalty to his friends, his unfailing honesty and forthrightness, his industry, his patriotism both political and literary. Far too often Burns' peasanthood is mentioned and then forgot; but his biographer must ever remember, as does Professor Ferguson, that he "was twenty-six before he ever entered the home of a woman sufficiently well-to-do to have carpets on the floor." Finally, in addition to shrewd analysis of character, the work is notable for its suggestive criticism, such as the remark that Burns developed the dramatic lyric fifty years before Browning.

While not a complete Life, *Pride and Passion* is an eminently readable full length portrait, accurate in detail and skilful in shading, of a man who has been markedly unfortunate in his biographers. It makes clear what Burns felt when he predicted a century's passage would see him better thought of than in his own time, for, "It is not so much that he was conspicuously sinful as that he sinned conspicuously." He was, as Andrew Lang sagely remarked, "quite good enough as he is."

ROBERT T. FITZHUGH

University of Maryland

The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Edited by RALPH L. RUSK.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. 6 volumes.
\$30.00.

All serious students of American literature are profoundly indebted to Professor Rusk and the Columbia University Press for a monumental collection of Emerson's letters. They occupy six volumes, beautifully printed and bound, amounting to 3,200 well-filled pages. A total of 4,374 letters are now accounted for: 2,313 never printed before, 271 hitherto printed only in part, 509 listed because already available in print, and 1,281 listed because known to have been written but not accessible. This is indeed a vast supplement to the collections previously made by E. W. Emerson, Charles Eliot Norton, and others. One might wish that the text of all the previously known and the newly known letters had been published in an inclusive work, partly for convenience of use and partly because of "O. P." difficulties in the case of existing collections, though the expense of publishing would have been much greater. As it is, however, we have an enormous addition to the corpus of Emerson's writings. There were 12 volumes in the standard *Works*, there were 10 in the *Journals*, and we now have 6 large volumes of *Letters* ranging from the year in which Washington was captured by the British to the year in which Chester A. Arthur became President. In view of the growing tendency to recognize in Emerson the greatest of American writers, this is happy and justified abundance.

In comparison with all previous editors Professor Rusk is meticulously expert. He prepared a literal text with the aid of photostatic reproductions of virtually all the manuscripts, which enabled him to check and recheck freely. The photostats will be preserved in the Columbia University Library and thus be accessible for verification of the text in case the original letters are destroyed or lost. The text is heavily annotated, the notes indicating, among other things, the ownership of all manuscripts and the works in which already printed texts are to be found. The notes also contain explanatory quotations from hundreds of letters addressed to Emerson. The index to the set amounts to 286 pages printed in double-column. As an indefatigably careful scholar Professor Rusk well deserves the confidence placed in him by the Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association, which possesses the most important collection of the original letters.

The value of the new materials it would be premature to assess now. Professor Rusk has suggested it in his attractively-written Introduction, but many other scholars will have to use the new fund placed at their disposal before its total significance will be clear. Suffice it to indicate here some of the things that can be done with

the letters. First, one may find in them fresh evidence of the nature of Emerson's personality—of his humor, his courtesy, his capacity for anger, the real coldness and real warmth of his temperament, to mention qualities touched upon by his editor, who expresses the judgment that the letters are "the most satisfactory record of the personality of Emerson" which we possess. Then, one may find new biographical details,—of his actions, his comings and goings, his relations with many people,—details which will doubtless take their place in the biography of Emerson upon which Professor Rusk is now engaged. Again, one may find new light upon Emerson's works, upon their genesis, the influences upon them, and the like. And again, one may study more closely than has hitherto been possible the growth of his mind—his changing interests and opinions, his response to his experience of life and books.

It would be too much to say that we have in these letters the "true" Emerson, Emerson off his guard, for he was never really off his guard. But he is less calculating here than in his works, less self-conscious than in his journals. A large proportion of the new letters are addressed to members of his family, most notably those to his older brother William (which cover more than half a century), to Aunt Mary Moody, to Lidian Emerson and to his children. Though even here one must read between the lines, they bring us close to the Emerson who lived in the flesh.

NORMAN FOERSTER

University of Iowa

Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di Walter Pater. By FEDERICO OLIVERO. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1939. Pp. 388.

This study is written against a background, literary, philosophic, and religious, which is overwhelming. Clarity of argument often disappears behind plurality of reference, and parallels are found in all ages and climes. The first chapter contains a comparison between Pater and Job; the book ends with quotations from Rilke. The emphasis is somewhat distorted by Professor Olivero's particular interests: Francis Thompson, Poe, Carlyle, Dante, loom large. Pater's religious thought is made too positive; his aesthetic thought becomes a pendant, a postscript.

The central argument itself shows Pater in an unusual light. He, no less than his hero Marius, possesses an *anima naturaliter Christiana*, and art for him becomes, like Roman Catholic ritual, a means toward apprehending more fully a mystical Christian faith. In a sense this shift in emphasis is salutary. Olivero's chapter on Pater's ascetic austerity is one of the best in the book. But the

suggested conclusion that Pater was a Christian believer can be over-simplified. Desire to believe is not the same as belief. Nor does the career of Marius leave a single, simple effect of the triumph of Christianity. "The Epicurean" is the protagonist, and Cornelius merely his inspiring Christian friend. Pater is nothing if not a master of ambiguity and nuance: he remains in the "gray, austere evening" he loves, and does not step into the full light of faith.

Olivero handles his argument topically, with important chapters on the spell which ritualism would inevitably cast upon Pater, on the spiritual refinement Pater gives to pagan philosophies, on his never-ending self-portraiture, on his sensitive use of symbolic landscapes, on his ceaseless dwelling upon suffering, sorrow, and death. There are finely turned incidental remarks.

The book, nevertheless, is not wholly satisfactory, because it often tries to retrace through intelligence a meaning which depends upon indeterminate emotion. On the other hand, it is not sufficiently analytical; the focus is not sharp; the argument is not progressive; significant points are lost among details. It is a leisurely re-assembling, under arbitrary categories, of *dissecta membra* from Pater's works, as if glass fragments of medieval cathedral windows were to be collected in boxes according to reds and blues. Our pleasure comes from glints of remembered colors, but the original patterns and artifice have been destroyed. The fundamental purpose of the book, however, and its extensive scope, are admirable, for Pater has too long been considered a dilettante.

Princeton, New Jersey

DONALD A. STAUFFER

The Personal Heresy, a controversy. By E. M. W. TILLYARD and C. S. LEWIS. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 150. \$2.00.

The personal heresy is the doctrine that poetry expresses primarily the "personality" of the poet and that what we ought to derive from the reading of poems is a deeper acquaintance with their authors. The fighting words in this doctrine are of course "primarily" and "personality" for no one would disagree with the theory that along with other things some degree or measure of a man's personality is expressed. However colorless a verbal expression may be, its very lack of color is expressive of a personality. As the French philosopher, M. Brunschvicg, has said, the way a man orders a meal tells you something of his soul. The difficulty arises when a certain emphasis is put upon the personal expression.

Both authors engage in a controversy which has a double interest, the interest in the subject matter itself and the interest in the

dramatic development of that subject matter. The controversy was real, not cooked up for the occasion, and both Messrs. Tillyard and Lewis are serious readers of poetry and skilled expositors of ideas. That they land in eventual disagreement on the major issue and harmony on the minors, that they succeed in making clearer certain terms and in indicating obscurities where the ordinary speaker would see only brilliance, must be expected from so profound a debate.

If a reviewer may engage in argument with the authors, it may be worth while suggesting that this is a good proof of the "multi-valence" of works of art. Poems tell stories, give emotional intensity to ideas, convey sensations from one man to another and express personalities. There is moreover value in all. The trouble with "The Personal Heresy" is inherent in the *a priori* method of arguing from verbal formulas instead of from history. If one says, Poems are made of words; words express thoughts; therefore poems express thoughts, one has a perfect argument. Likewise, if one says, Poems express thoughts; thoughts express personalities; therefore poems express personalities. We have no revelation to tell us whether thoughts are more important than personalities; at times they have been esteemed very highly, at other times, they have been esteemed less highly. Mr. Tillyard and Mr. Lewis would appear to have a temperamental division on this point. History shows that they are not unique in this division. Is it not possible that—among other things—poems are thoughts expressed by personalities? Is it not moreover possible that the peculiar value of a poem is precisely the curious combination of the valuable thought and the valuable personality?

GEORGE BOAS

The Johns Hopkins University

Tom Brown of Facetious Memory: Grub Street in the Age of Dryden. By BENJAMIN BOYCE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 216. \$2.50.

This scholarly, readable book is important for two reasons. On the one hand, it provides the first accurate, full-length account of one of the most amusing, if also one of the most disreputable, contemporaries of Dryden; and on the other, it illuminates the history of Grub Street during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, when for the first time professional men of letters found it possible to earn a living without recourse either to patrons or to the stage. Tom Brown, satirist, journalist, translator, pamphleteer, and poet, was the "foremost hackney author" of this

period. He never had a patron and he never wrote any plays; but he knew what the reading public wanted and managed to support himself by his pen for sixteen years, from 1688 to 1704. He was a scurrilous fellow, in many ways,—witty, but also quarrelsome, coarse, and debauched. These are the qualities for which he is remembered today, thanks to the damnation heaped upon his memory by succeeding writers who are now more read than he. But the observant author of such satires as *Amusements Serious and Comical* and *Letters from the Dead to the Living* cannot have been utterly despicable; and Professor Boyce, without minimizing Brown's notorious deficiencies, does a service to scholarship by calling attention also to the solidity of his learning, the independence of his character, and the integrity of his political and religious principles. Whatever else may be alleged against him, Brown was neither a trimmer nor a turncoat.

Professor Boyce analyzes the sources, English and European, of many of Brown's works, and traces Brown's considerable influence on such writers as Addison, Swift, Fielding, Sterne, and even Lamb. His bibliography of Brown's works is one of the most useful features of his book. Brown often wrote anonymously or in collaboration with others, and many titles have been mistakenly attributed to him. Hence to have brought order out of the chaos of Brown's bibliography is no minor achievement. Two trifling additions to Professor Boyce's list of miscellanies are here suggested. *The Diverting Post*, 1704, contains an epigram on Queen Anne ascribed to Brown. Other extant editions of *The Pleasant Musical Companion* (Boyce No. 3, pp. 189-90) appeared in 1687, 1709, and 1724.

CYRUS L. DAY

The University of Delaware

Rehabilitations and other essays. By C. S. LEWIS. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. x + 197. \$2.50.

In *Rehabilitations*, Mr. C. S. Lewis devotes nine essays to the defense of poets, programs and points of view which are well worth discussion even though the value of the book is less in the points made than in the impulses toward dissent it arouses in the reader.

In the defense of Shelley as against Dryden, Mr. T. S. Eliot is the peg on whom Mr. Lewis hangs his argument and—some may think—himself by the statement: "When Mr. Eliot offers up Shelley as a sacrifice to the fame of Dryden it is time to call a halt." If Mr. Eliot had done anything of the sort many a reader might cheer the champion. The fact is that in Mr. Eliot's Dryden

papers¹ I find only two references to Shelley. The first is in the *Homage*,² where six lines by Dryden, which are not in the *Oxford Book of English Verse*, are compared with six by Shelley which are in the book. Mr. Eliot's gesture which is to be halted is: "we might defy any one to show us that the second is superior in intrinsic poetic merit." Mr. Eliot's second reference is a comparison between Shelley and Shakespeare.³ Mr. Lewis' main argument begins no more auspiciously than the supposed occasion for it. He will, he says, "maintain that Shelley is to be regarded . . . as a more masterly, a more sufficient and indeed a more *classical* [this emphasis is not mine] poet than Dryden." No one can object to this point of view as long as the word "classical" retains its present flexibility; but Mr. Lewis omits no opportunities. His argument is: If anyone who has read Sophocles, Virgil, Racine or Milton thinks Pope is a classicist we may "dismiss him as a block-head." Therefore Dryden is not a classicist and thus—though the logic seems strained—Shelley is a better classicist (pp. 4-5). It is these irrelevancies of judgment which help to make Mr. Lewis a pleasant summer companion and a dangerous guide.

Two essays defend the Oxford school of English Studies. The second goes over the familiar ground of what are we to do about liberal education in a society which requires technical training. The first defends the three papers required in the literary course at Oxford. These are on Modern English "which deals mainly with the history of meaning," on Anglo-Saxon texts and on Middle English texts. Because English students, like American students, are seldom able to understand what they read, the two sentences which follow are heartening: "I am told that there are critics of Chaucer who have . . . built up formidable superstructures on a purely intuitive and sometimes erroneous conception of their author's meaning" (p. 62); "Again and again curious statements in the essays of our pupils can be traced back to an original failure to make out the sense of Milton or Johnson or Coleridge." The defense of papers on Old and Middle English texts is that they are not philological. Their value is in the fact that poetry in Old English or French or Mediaeval Latin—though the latter texts "are hard to translate" (p. 71) are closer to Modern English than the poetry of Greece and Rome. The Graeco-Latin contribution is matter, the Old English contribution is inspiration.

The defense of William Morris is that a critical revolution "may yet embarrass these scattered and inoffensive readers with the

¹ *Homage to John Dryden*, published by Leonard and Virginia Woolf at the Hogarth Press, London, 1924; *Selected Essays*, Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1932 (I think that the pagination in the English edition differs slightly); and *John Dryden, the poet, the dramatist, the critic, three essays*, New York, Holiday, 1932.

² American edition of *Selected Essays*, p. 265.

³ *John Dryden*, p. 36.

discovery of what they regard as . . . perhaps a shamefaced indulgence has all along been a gratifying proof of their penetration and even contemporaneity" (p. 38). The Union Catalog of the Library of Congress has 387 entries for Morris, indicating that he has been printed in whole or in part on an average of 46 times each year since 1866, and 17 of these appeared in the last nine years. The "scattered and shamefaced readers" seem to be numerous. Other essays in the collection are on popular literature, Christianity and Literature and a semantic nightmare.

Mr. Lewis wears his erudition gravely and though the horses he beats are, for the most part, dead, it is doubtless worth while to tap them occasionally when English societies meet lest they should astonish us by coming to life.

R. D. JAMESON

Library of Congress

BRIEF MENTION

The Literature of the English Bible. By WILBUR OWEN SYPHERD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. 230. \$2.00. Once more the Bible has come into its own. Succeeding such well-known works as those of Moulton, Sanders and Kent, Fowler, McFadyen, Muilenberg, and Gardiner, Professor Sypherd of the University of Delaware presents an account of the origin and composition of the English Bible closing with eight appendices essential for the understanding of much about Holy Scriptures. The Introduction treats the English Bible issued in 1611, the Composition of the Biblical Books, Manuscript Copies and Transmission of Scriptures, English Translations of Separate Biblical Books, and the Bible as a whole. Reference is made to the Douay Version of the Catholic Church but none to the Jewish Version called "The Holy Scriptures," published by the Jewish Publication Society of America in 1917 and certainly worthy of notice. That our author is greatly influenced by the so-called "Higher Criticism," is seen by his attention paid to the historical background, the various sources of the material, and the literary form of each of the writings of the Hebrew Canon, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and the New Testament. Particularly interesting and illuminating is the characterization of the prophets in Israel, the explanation of Hebrew poetry with suitable illustrations, the indication of propagandistic writings, the delineation of the New Testament thought as differentiated from the Old Testament philosophy, and the assignment of reason why Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings were excluded from the Canons. Professor Sypherd has given us a valuable introduction to

Scriptures, presenting his subject-matter in a scholarly, and, at the same time, popular manner. His work deserves to have a place among the text-books used not only in the departments of English, but also in the departments of Sacred Literature, at colleges and universities.

WILLIAM ROSENAU

Rossetti's Sister Helen. Edited by JANET CAMP TROXELL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 95. \$5.00. Rossetti's 'Sister Helen' is, like 'The Blessed Damozel,' a conspicuous example of a poet's continual revision, and in this edition Mrs Troxell has collected the various readings of fifteen different 'sources,' ranging from the earliest print (in *The Dusseldorf Artist's Album*) in 1854 to the *Poems* of 1881, and including a series of proof copies and published editions with Rossetti's manuscript corrections and alterations. Instead of a formal collation based on the final version, the editor has printed in order the first form of each stanza (usually from *The Dusseldorf Artist's Album*), the stanza as it appears in the manuscript in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and as it appears in the proofs which Rossetti had at Penkill Castle in August 1869, and then to these versions has added in notes the intermediate or subsequent changes. This somewhat unusual method has the advantage of permitting a reader who is not expert in interpreting formal collations to follow Rossetti's alterations step by step, and it provides, of course, the materials for those who prefer to make their own apparatus. "The principal value of this study," says Mrs Troxell truly, "lies in the revelation of exactly when Rossetti made the changes that we know, and the disclosure of the fact that he made others that did not survive long enough to appear in any regular edition." Besides this the volume is handsomely printed and illustrated with plates from the *Düsseldorf Album* and the proofs showing Rossetti's alterations.

Duke University

P. F. BAUM

Ben Jonson (A Concise Bibliography). By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM. Elizabethan Bibliographies, No. 2. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1938. Pp. viii + 152. \$5.00. Dr. Tannenbaum's *Elizabethan Bibliographies* are quarries of useful references, but they are not easy to use. Over half the items in this bibliography are lumped together under "Biography and Commentary," alphabetically arranged by author but without further classification. Thus to find what has been written on *Volpone* or Jonson's epigrams, one has to look through 72 pages of bibliography. A reference work should at least separate biography from

criticism, and general criticism from comment limited to a particular work. The section "Autographs and Manuscripts" is not a complete guide to Jonson's autographs, since it mentions only two of Jonson's autograph letters and none of his signatures at the Public Record Office. But it makes several additions to Herford and Simpson's list of "Books in Jonson's Library," including copies of Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* and *Battle of Agincourt*. The bibliography performs good service in calling attention to unpublished theses preserved in the libraries of American universities, and in furnishing a list of musical settings to Jonson's songs.

University of Wisconsin

MARK ECCLES

Elizabethan and Seventeenth-Century Lyrics. Selected and edited by MATTHEW W. BLACK. Chicago [etc.]: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1938. Pp. xii + 624. \$4.00. The 580 pieces in this admirably printed but heavy volume are derived from Professor Schelling's *Elizabethan Lyrics* and *Seventeenth Century Lyrics* with the omission of over 100 and the addition of 225 poems. The arrangement is a compromise, being in the main chronological but in part according to subject-matter or form or type or provenience. Thus Wotton's "How happy is he born or taught" is 247 pages earlier than his "You meaner beauties of the night," sonnets are found in four sections besides the one to which they give the name, and Donne's religious pieces are separated from his secular while Herrick's are not. "The Pastoralists," "The Sonneteers," and "Lyrics in Song-books" illustrate the different bases of classification. There are brief notes, a curious bibliography of twelve titles, a chapter on the lyric in general, one on Elizabethan meters, and briefer ones (valuable sometimes for information, sometimes for illumination) prefixed to each of the ten groups into which the poems are divided. The selection could hardly be improved within the allotted space but this space is inadequate for the greatest century and a half of the English lyric, 1557-1700. One misses, for example, Campion's "Rose-cheeked Laura, come," Carew's "He that loves a rosy cheek," Rochester's "I cannot change as others do" and "Absent from thee I languish still."

R. D. H.

Annual Bibliography of English Language & Literature, Volume XVIII, 1937. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by MARY S. SERJEANTSON assisted by LESLIE N. BROUGHTON. Cambridge: University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 311 + iv. 8s. 6d. (United States Agents: University of Chicago Press). This

admirably arranged and carefully indexed volume, indispensable because of its accuracy and inclusiveness, contains about 5000 items. Unfortunately it reaches us a year and a half after the publication of the first titles listed and, more unfortunately, this is the last volume that Miss Serjeantson will be able to edit. Except for a review of Lewis's *Hope for Poetry*, one looks in vain for the names of Auden, Spender, Day Lewis, or Odetts. The number of items appearing under the names of the various writers is of some interest: Borrow, 0; T. Warton, 0; Henry James, 2; Hazlitt, 2; Yeats, 3; Meredith, 4; Joyce, 6; Pope, 10; Byron, 13; Coleridge, 14; Swift, 21; Johnson, 23; Shelley, 26; Kipling, 28; Wordsworth, 30; Milton, 62; Dickens, 62; Shakespeare, 241.

R. D. H.

Sir David Lyndsay, Poet, and Satirist of the Old Church in Scotland. By W. MURISON. Cambridge: at The University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938. Pp. xiv, 227. \$3.75. The author summarizes his book thus (p. xiii): "the following pages are an attempt to tell something about Lyndsay and his works, and also to indicate and justify his attitude to the old Scottish Church." The first chapter (19 pages) gives us a sketch of Lyndsay's life; the second (55 pages), an account of his poems; the third (five pages), a critical estimate of his poetry. Chapter IV (30 pages) sets forth Lyndsay's charges against the (as yet unreformed) Scottish Church of his day, and chapter V (81 pages) attempts to show, by evidence drawn "not from sources hostile to the Roman Church, but from official records of the Church, from state documents, and from writers loyal to the Church" (p. viii), that Lyndsay's charges were well founded. The book ends with a conclusion (four pages), a bibliography (three pages), a glossary (16 pages), and an index (three pages). It is well printed, well bound, and attractively got up.

K. M.

Books known to Anglo-Latin writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670-804). By J. D. A. OGILVY. Med. Acad. of America, Studies and Documents No. 2: Cambridge, Mass., 1936. Pp. xxii, 109. \$2.25. This lithoprint is a Harvard doctoral dissertation. Though far from exhaustive, and somewhat careless in execution, it will prove useful to students of the period. The author's modesty disarms criticism, but see the reviews of Raby and Beeson in *MLR.* xxxii 464 ff. and *MP.* xxxiv 315 ff. The name of the Heathobards is misspelt on p. 47.

K. M.

Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters Palace of Pleasure. By JOSEF RAITH. Leipzig: Robert Noske, 1936. Pp. viii, 167. RM 5. This volume is No. 3 in the monograph series "Aus Schriftum und Sprache der Angelsachsen," edited by Professors Hittmair and Spindler. The author gives to his book the sub-title "Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in England." Neither title nor sub-title, however, makes clear the scope of the work, which comes down to the end of the nineteenth century, and might well have been called simply Boccaccio in English Literature, even though the drama (except for Shakespeare's *Troilus*) is left out. The period from Chaucer to Painter is considered on pp. 7 to 113; the next section, pp. 114 to 135, takes up Italian *novelle* in English literature from 1567 to 1620; this is followed by a section, pp. 136 to 154, on Boccaccio in English literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The work is concluded with an appendix on Latin translations of Boccaccio. It will be seen that Raith's book is only a survey of the field. As such, it has value, and the author's remarks on this and that (e. g. on the realism of Chaucer, p. 8) are often acute.

K. M.

Englische Fürstenspiegel vom Policraticus Johannis von Salisbury bis zum Basilikon Doron König Jakobs I. By W. KLEINEKE. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer, 1937. Pp. viii, 223. RM 9. This survey of books of instruction for princes is No. 90 of Morsbach's well known monograph series, *Studien zur englischen Philologie*. The author casts his net wide, including even the Latin poem on the Battle of Lewes. He has packed much into his volume, and has adequately sketched the history of such books of instruction in England from the twelfth to the seventeenth century. Scottish activity in the same field is also considered (see pp. 96, 141 f., and 200 ff.), though only the *Basilikon* gets extended treatment.

K. M.

Beowulf, ed. F. OLIVERO. Torino: S. Lattes & C., 1937. Pp. clx, 255. L. 30. This is a translation into French of Olivero's Italian edition of 1934 (reviewed in *MLN.*, LI, 416). The translator was Camille Monnet. Apart from the difference in language, the new edition seems to be identical with the old; thus, the erroneous derivation of *ór* from Latin *hora* reappears on p. cxxii. The two editions have the same format.

K. M.

The Seege of Troye, A Study . . . by G. HOFSTRAND. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups Forlag, 1936. Pp. xvi, 205. This volume is the fourth of the newly started series, Lund Studies in English. The author gives to it the sub-title, "A study in the intertextual relations of the ME romance the Seege or Batayle of Troye." This study is based primarily on the EETS edition of the romance (vol. 172, 1926) by Miss M. E. Barnicle, although other editions and studies have also been used, especially that of Hibler. The author collated the texts of B. and H. with all four MSS of the *Seege*; his work was thus not wholly dependent on the printed texts. His book is divided into ten parts of unequal length (besides introduction and bibliography). In Parts I-VII he systematically studies and compares the readings of the MSS, and establishes a stemma. Part VIII takes up literary influences reflected in the text, and Part IX deals with the problem of the dialect of the lost original text. Part X, "some notes on the source question," was written before the publication of the *Excidium Troie* of MS Rawlinson D 893, which, as the author notes (p. xii), "throws new light on the question." This previously unknown work is briefly discussed on pp. 202 f. Mr. Hofstrand's book is a creditable doctor's dissertation.

K. M.

Valentine and Orson, translated from the French by HENRY WATSON. Edited by A. DICKSON. EETS, vols. 204. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1937. Pp. lxiv, 375. \$8. This translation of the sixteenth century is here reprinted from the unique copy of the second edition in the Huntington Library; a surviving fragment of the first edition is also reprinted at the appropriate place in the text, and the 12 pages missing from the second edition have been supplied from the British Museum copy of the third edition. The introduction considers briefly the story as such, the French romance, the history of the English text, the translator, the language of the sixteenth century as reflected in the text, the woodcuts of the Huntington volume, and the influence of the work upon Spenser, Shakespeare, Cervantes and Bunyan. The text is followed by 13 pages of notes and a glossary of 21 pages. The work is concluded with an index of proper names. The editor has made himself an authority on this romance, and no better man could have been found to edit Watson's translation. This volume will be especially welcome, of course, to students of the sixteenth century, but many others will find it interesting and useful.

K. M.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Armour, Richard W. and Howes, Raymond F.—Coleridge the talker. *Ithaca, New York*: Cornell U. Press, 1940. Pp. xvi + 480. \$4.00.

Browning. — Browning's "Roman murder story" as recorded in a hitherto unknown Italian contemporary manuscript. Transl. E. H. Yarrill. Introd. W. O. Raymond. *Waco, Texas*: Baylor U. Press, 1939. Pp. 47. (Baylor Bulletin, xlii, 4.)

Callahan, J. J.—Science of language. Vol. ii—Word study. *Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*: Duquesne U. Press, 1939. Pp. xvii + 272.

French, J. Milton.—Milton in Chancery, new chapters in the lives of the poet and his father. *New York*: Modern Language Association, 1939. Pp. x + 428. [Monograph Series, X.]

Garrod, H. W.—Keats. (Second edition.) *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1939. Pp. 155. \$2.00.

Gilbert, Katharine E. and Kuhn, H.—A history of esthetics. *New York*: Macmillan, 1939. Pp. xxii + 582. \$4.25.

Gilman, Wilbur E. — Milton's rhetoric: studies in his defence of liberty. *Columbia, Missouri*: U. of Mo. Press, 1939. Pp. 193. \$1.25. (U. of Mo. Studies, xiv, 3.)

Hayakawa, S. Q. and Jones, H. M.—Oliver Wendell Holmes. *New York, etc.*: American Book Co., 1939. Pp. cxxx + 472. (American Writers Series.)

Higby, C. P. and Schantz, B. T.—John Lothrop Motley. *New York, etc.*: American Book Co., 1939. Pp. clxii + 482. (American Writers Series.)

Manly, John M. and Rickert, Edith.—The text of The Canterbury Tales, studied on the basis of all known manuscripts. *Chicago, Illinois*: U. of Chicago Press, 1940. 8 volumes. Pp. xxiv + 690, viii + 518, x + 537, viii + 536, x + 554, viii + 673, viii + 617, viii + 551. (A Fiftieth Anniversary Publication of the U. of Chicago Press.)

Shakespeare.—King Lear, 1608 (Pied Bull Quarto). *London*: Shakespeare Assoc. and Sidgwick and Jackson, 1939. Pp. viii + 84 pp. of plates. 10 sh. 6 d. (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, 1.)

—The Merchant of Venice, 1600 (Hayes Quarto). *London*: Shakespeare Assoc. and Sidgwick and Jackson, 1939. Pp. viii + 76 pp. of plates. 10 sh. 6 d. (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, 2.)

—The Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602. *London*: Shakespeare Assoc. and Sidgwick

and Jackson, 1939. Pp. viii + 56 pp. of plates. 10 sh. 6 d. (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, 3.)

Spencer, Hazelton.—The art and life of William Shakespeare. *New York*: Harcourt, Brace, 1940. Pp. xx + 495. \$2.25.

Valency, Maurice J.—The tragedies of Herod and Mariamne. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 304. (Columbia U. Studies in Eng. and Comp. Lit., 145.)

Walpole, Horace.—Correspondence. Ed. W. S. Lewis and W. H. Smith. Vols. 3-8—With Madame du Deffaud, Mlle. Sanadon, and Wiart. *New Haven, Connecticut*: Yale U. Press, 1939. Pp. lxxxviii + 407, viii + 497, viii + 439, viii + 502, viii + 461, xiv + 561. \$45.00.

Zimmerman, Jane D. (ed.). — Phonetic transcriptions from "American Speech." (Revised edition.) *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 83. \$1.60. ["American Speech" Reprints and Monographs, 1.]

GERMAN

Adams, John Quincy.—Oberon, A Poetical Romance in twelve books. Translated from the German of Wieland (1799-1801). Edited with an Introduction and Notes by A. B. Faust. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1940. xcii, 340 pp. \$3.00.

Eickmann, Walter Theodore.—The semiological development of the pronominal adverbs of motion in Old High German. Abridgement of Thesis. *New York*: New York Univ. 1939. 18 pp.

Fuehrer, Sister Mary Rosina.—A Study of the Relation of the Dutch Lancelot and the Flemish Percheval Fragments to the Manuscripts of Chrétien's *Conte Del Graal*. Diss. [Catholic Univ. of America, Studies in German Vol. XIV]. *Washington, D. C.*: 1939. xi, 163 pp.

Goodloe, Jane F.—In Dichters Lande. Erlebtes und Gestaltetes von August Winnig, Ernst Wiechert, Hermann Hesse, Börries, Freiherrn von Münchhausen. Ed. with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. *New York*: Crofts & Co., 1939. xxii, 201 pp. \$1.40.

Heller, Otto, and Leon, Theodore H.—Charles Sealsfield Bibliography of his Writings together with a classified and annotated Catalogue of Literature relating to his works and his life. With a Foreword by Henry A. Pochmann. [Washington Univ. Studies, N. S., Language and Literature, No. 8]. *St. Louis*: 1939. x, 88 pp.

Kramer, Priscilla M.—The Cyclical Method of Composition in Gottfried Keller's *Sinnegedicht*. [New York Univ. Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs No. 26]. *New York*: 1939. vii, 318 pp.

Long, O. W.—Frederic Henry Hedge, A Cosmopolitan Scholar. *Portland, Maine*:

The Southworth-Anthoensen Press, 1940. 53 pp.

Schaerli, E.—Kriminalkommissar Hornleighs Erlebnisse. Adapted. Boston: Heath [1940]. 93 pp.

Scheel, Käthe.—Untersuchungen über den Satzbau der niederdeutschen Volkssprache und Kunstprosa. Diss. Hamburg. [Sprache und Schrifttum. 2 = Forschungen. Hrg. für den Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschungen. N. F. Reihe B.]. [Neumünster]: Wachholtz, 1939. xi, 116 pp. M. 5.

Schiller.—Zum 150. Gedenktag von Schillers Antrittsvorlesung: Schiller, Idealismus und Tragik. Rede von Dr. Carl Wesle.—Schiller als Dichter der Freiheit. Rede von Dr. Bruno Bauch. [Jenaer akademische Reden. H. 26]. Jena: Fischer, 1939. 30 pp. M. 1.60.

Walter, Karl.—Karl von Lohbauer (1777-1809), Königl. Württ. Hauptmann und Ritter des Militär-Verdienst-Ordens. Schicksal eines württembergischen Soldaten und deutschen Dichters während Deutschlands tiefster Erniedrigung. Mit 9 Abbildungen. [Veröffentlichungen des Archivs d. Stadt Stuttgart. H. 4]. Stuttgart: Kraiss, 1939. 35 pp. 4°. M. 1.50.

FRENCH

Berzé, Hugues de.—La "Bible" au seigneur de Berzé, éd. crit. de F. Lecoy. Paris: Droz, 1938. 71 pp. Fr. 20.

Cedeyco, Joseph.—German Criticism of Anatole France. Abstract of Ill. diss. Urbana: 1939. 8 pp.

Clark, A. F. B.—Jean Racine. Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1939. vi + 354 pp. \$3.50. (Harvard St. in Comp. Lit., 16.)

Hulubei, Alice.—L'Eglogue en Fr. au XVI^e siècle (1515-89). Paris: Droz, 1938. xxiv + 794 pp. Fr. 200.

—Répertoire des églogues en Fr. au XVI^e s. Ibid., 1939. xi + 117 pp. Fr. 20.

Lot, F.—Joseph Bédier. Paris: Droz, 1939. 55 pp. Fr. 12.

Marfan, L.-A.—Venance Dougados, 1763-94, un jeune poète victime de la Révolution. Toulouse: Privat, 1938. 380 pp. Fr. 30.

Micha, A.—La Tradition manuscrite des romans de Chrétien de Troyes. Paris: Droz, 1939. 402 pp. Fr. 100.

Montchrestien.—Aman, a Critical Ed. by G. O. Seiver. Philadelphia: U. of Pa. Press, 1939. x + 163 pp.

Pange, comtesse Jean de.—A.-G. Schlegel et Mme de Staël. Diss. Paris: Albert, 1939. 650 pp.

Pure, de.—La Prétieuse ou le mystère des ruelles, 3^e et 4^e parties, ed. E. Magne. Paris: Droz, 1939. 340 pp. Fr. 30. (Soc. des t. fr. mod.)

Ronsard, Œuvres complètes. X. Ed. crit. de P. Laumonier. Paris: Droz, 1939. xxxi + 399 pp. Fr. 40. (Soc. des t. fr. m.)

Siciliano, Italo.—Le Origini delle Canzoni di gesta. Padua: A. Milani, 1940. 221 pp.

Sylvain, Suzanne.—Le Créole haïtien. Port-au-Prince: 1936. 180 pp.

ITALIAN

Amelotti, G.—Il Leopardi maggiore (Opera postuma), con una appendice sul "Discorso sullo stato presente degli Italiani" e una pref. di S. E. A. Farinelli. Genova: Emiliano degli Orfini, 1939. 230 pp. L. 15.

Cian, V.—La satira. (Dal Medioevo al Pontano). Milano: F. Vallardi, 1939. xii + 535 pp. leg. L. 65. (Storia dei Generi letterari.)

Cocchiara, G.—Problemi di poesia popolare. Palermo: Palumbo, 1939. 154 pp. L. 15.

De Robertis, Giuseppe.—Saggi, con una noterella. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1939. 207 pp. L. 12.

Gasparrini Leporace, Tullia.—I manoscritti capilupiani della Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma. Roma: Ist. poligr. dello Stato, 1939. xxiv + 147 pp. L. 20.

Guasti, Cesare.—Memorie e studi. Pagine scelte da R. Nuti. Firenze: Marzocco, 1939. xi + 369 pp. L. 15.

Mussini, C.—Alessandro Tassoni. Torino: Paravia, 1939. 128 pp. L. 5.

Petronio, G.—Francesco De Sanctis. Torino: Paravia, 1939. 128 pp. L. 5.

Tenneroni, M. e A.—Jacopone da Todì. Roma: Rassegna Nazionale, 1939. 34 pp. L. 3.50.

Zaccagnini, G.—Giuseppe Giusti. Pistoia: Casa Ed. Tariffi, 1939. vii + 207 pp. L. 12.

SPANISH

Adams, N. B., and Place, E. B.—Lecturas modernas. New York: Crofts, 1938. viii + 168 pp. \$1.20.

Arjona, D. K. and J. H.—A Bibliog. of Textbooks of Spanish pub. in the U. S. Arbor: Edwards, 1939 (lithotyped).

Azucla, Mariano.—Los de abajo, ed. J. B. Englekirk and L. B. Kiddle. New York: Crofts, 1939. lviii + 181 pp. \$1.40.

Espinosa, A. M.—Historia de la literatura española. New York: Oxford, 1939. xl + 349 pp. \$1.80.

Garófalo Mesa, M. G.—Plácido. Poeta y Martir. Mexico: Eds. Botas, 1938. 205 pp.

Hartsook, J. H.—Béquer and Heine: Comparison. Abstract of Ill. diss. Urbana: 1939. 10 pp.

Mitchell, S. L.—Intermediate Sp. Comp. New York: Longmans, Green, 1938. \$1.50.

1940

Ed. crit.
9. xxi
m.)
Canzoni
221 pp.
half-tien.

e (Opera
Discorso
e una
miliano

ioevo al
39. xix
Generi

popolare
L. 15.
con una
39. 207

moscritta
ale Cen-
r. della

Pagine
co, 1939

Torino:

is. Te

la Tod
34 pp

Pistoia:
L. 12

Lectura
viii +

biog. d
S. 4

ed. J. B
York

teratur
9. xl +

Poeta
205 pp
Heine:
Urbano

. Comp
\$1.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

NEW BOOKS

MUSIC AND EDGAR ALLAN POE

By MAY GARRETTSON EVANS

How great the influence of Poe on composers of music has been, and how varied and extensive their response to his magic, Miss Evans has undertaken to show in this work, which though it includes an exact and thorough bibliography is much more than a mere bibliographical study. It is a fresh contribution to the literary history of Poe, the most written about of American poets; and one's first thought is wonder that such a study has not been made before. 106 pages, \$1.75

THE CRITICAL WORKS OF JOHN DENNIS

Edited by EDWARD NILES HOOKER

Over a century and a half ago Dr. Johnson remarked that Dennis's critical works should be collected, an opinion which has been echoed by other distinguished writers from Southey to Spingarn. Wordsworth and Coleridge expressed a deep interest in Dennis's ideas, and Landor and Swinburne praised in extravagant terms his criticism and the rugged strength of his prose style. Many of his essays are rare, costly, and, in consequence, difficult of access. No American library has them all and only five have been reprinted in our century. Vol. I, 547 pages, \$5.00

THE GATHERING OF THE WEST

By JOHN GALT

Edited with an introductory essay and a glossary by Bradford Allen Booth. *The Gathering of the West* is the only one of Galt's Scottish stories that has never been republished. It deserves a better fate, and its reappearance now on the one hundredth anniversary of Galt's death will raise, not lower, Galt's reputation. It is written with spirit and vigor, with broad lines of rich humor. 118 pages, \$1.50

NEW POETRY OF NEW ENGLAND: FROST AND ROBINSON

By ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

New Poetry of New England contains the six lectures delivered by Mr. Coffin on the Percy Graeme Turnbull Poetry Foundation at The Johns Hopkins University in 1938. Mr. Coffin, as a native of Maine, a poet of distinction, and a student of poetry, was peculiarly well qualified to give these lectures. He first draws a picture of nineteenth-century conditions under which developed the poetry of confidence, then describes the changes that have taken place in New England, resulting in idle harbors, abandoned farm-houses, and fields that are again invaded by the forest, as well as the sturdy resistance offered by certain elements of the population. 164 pages, \$2.00

THE OLD GERMANIC PRINCIPLES OF NAME-GIVING

By HENRY BOSLEY WOLF

The purpose of this book is to survey, as thoroughly as the monuments permit, the naming-customs of the various Germanic peoples during the period of migrations. It is primarily a study of alliteration, variation, and repetition as principles of name-giving among our Germanic ancestors of the early middle ages; but it also touches on such matters as the use of compound and uncompounded names, the growth of nicknames and second-names, the rôle of woman in naming, the meaning and appropriateness of names, the connection between closeness of kinship and name-similarity, and the giving of Christian names at baptism. 311 pages, \$4.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

HARVITT'S

*Representative Plays
from the French
Theatre of Today*

A variety of plays preferred by many instructors but not easily accessible to the large majority of students. The introduction gives an excellent brief history of the twentieth-century French theatre. For advanced classes.

Ready this spring

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London

READY IN APRIL

**LA DEUXIÈME ÉTAPE EN
LANGUE FRANÇAISE**

M. S. PARGMENT

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- A complete second year or second semester book designed to follow the author's *Initiation à la langue française*.

Features:

- Comprehensive review of grammar.
- Abundance of lively reading material.
- Gradation of Syntax and Vocabulary.

Probable Price \$1.68

Initiation à la langue française \$1.68

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY NEW YORK